Published on 15th of each month.

Vol. VIII., No. 1. APRIL, 1918.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

LIBRARY

A Magazine to maintain the cause of TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS in the Church of England.

"By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance."—*Erasmus.*

"A State without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation."—*Edmund Burke.*

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS.

A GREAT PRIMATE.—By the Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.

LABOUR AND THE CHURCH.—By H. F. WALKER.

TOWARDS CHRISTIAN UNITY.—By the EDITOR.

THE READER IN THE EARLY CHURCH.—
By Rev. C. L. FELTOE, D.D.

WOMEN IN THE CHURCH.—
By the Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

A FAMOUS WAR SERMON.—By Rev. T. F. ROYDS, M.A.

REVIEWS—
An Episcopal Appeal to Conscience.
The Church in the Furnace.—By Rev. W. D. Bainbridge-Bell.
An Apology for the National Church.

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Practical Proposal.
The Bishop of Salisbury's Action.

Printer and Publisher: WILLIAM PARR, Knaresborough.
London Agent:—ELLIOT STOCK, 7, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Price 6d. net. Annual Subscription, 5/- (including postage).
[ENTERED AT STATIONERS HALL.]

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President:—Professor GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

Sir C. THOMAS DYKE-ACLAND, Bart., Holnicote, Taunton, Somerset.
PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E., Harrogate.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq., 62, Fellows Road, N.W.
The Rev. Canon CHARLES, D.D., F.B.A., 4, Little Cloisters, Westminster Abbey.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, Seaford Vicarage, Sussex.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, Rest, Hodford Road, Golders Green, N.W.
The Rev Professor HENSLOW, Danehurst, Branksome Wood Road, Bournemouth.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, Harvard University, U.S.A.
The Rev. W. MANNING, The Rectory, Chipping Barnet, Herts.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON, The Rectory, Marylebone, W.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, Acrise, Hall Place Gardens, St. Albans.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon PLUMPTRE, St. James' Cathedral, Toronto.
Sir EDWARD RUSSELL, 5, Croxteth Road, Liverpool.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq., 1, Wellington Street, Strand, London, W.C.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS, Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal, Canada.

Members of the Council:

Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, The College, Ely (*Chairman*).

Mr. F. H. ANSON.
Prof. Sir W. J. ASHLEY.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL.
Rev. Dr. CALDECOTT.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE.
Mr. F. C. CHANNING.
Rev. W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG.
Rev. Canon CREMER.
Rev. J. A. DODD.
Rev. C. W. EMMET.
Rev. J, GAMBLE.
Miss ALICE GARDNER.
Mr. W. B. GORDON.
Rev. H. HANDLEY.
Mr. H. G. HART.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR.
Rev. W. MANNING.
The Hon. Mrs. MATHESON.
Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS.
Rev. J. L. MILNE.
Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
Dr. CYRIL NORWOOD.
Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. Dr. RENDALL.
Rev. Dr. H. G. ROSEDALE.
Rev. C. J. SHARP.
Rev. C. R. SHAW-STEWART.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH.
Rev. J. E. SYMES.
Rev. H. H. SYMONDS.
Rev. J. M. THOMPSON.
Rev. Dr. TOLLINTON.
Rev. FERGUS WOOD.

Hon. Treasurer:—Sir RICHARD STAPLEY, 33, Bloomsbury Square, W.C.
Hon. Auditor.—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 10, Walbrook, E.C.
Hon. Secretary.—Rev. C. MOXON, Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire.
Hon. Assistant Secretaries.—Miss. D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Mr. LLEWELYN PREECE, 8, Queen Anne's Gate, S.W.

OBJECTS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church to restate her belief from time to time as required by the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit.
2.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness and corporate life of the Church of England, and her Christian spirit of tolerance in all things non-essential.
3.—To give all support in their power to those who are honestly and loyally endeavouring to vindicate the truths of Christianity by the light of scholarship and research; and while paying due regard to continuity, to work for such changes in the formularies and practices of the Church of England as from time to time are made necessary by the needs and knowledge of the day.
4.—To assert the rights and duties of the laity as constituent members of the Body of Christ
5.—To encourage friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

Annual Subscription:—Members at least 5/-; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. These should be paid to **Rev. C. Moxon,** 3, St. George's Square, London, S.W. 1.

"THE MODERN CHURCHMAN."

***The Modern Churchman*, the monthly organ of the Churchmen's Union, is sent *free* to all full members of the Union, and to non-members at a charge of 5/- per annum (postage paid).**

Editor:—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Copgrove Rectory, Burton Leonard, Harrogate, to whom all literary contributions and books for review should be sent.

Business Manager:—Mrs. MAJOR, Copgrove Rectory, Burton Leonard, Harrogate, receives all subscriptions, advts., changes of address, &c., for the *Modern Churchman*.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION. LAY SECTION.

Suggestions for consideration of the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State.

In part IV of the Report the Archbishops' Committee state that by "the Church" they mean the Church and not only the clergy, and add: "While we seek to retain for the clergy their special "function in the administration of the Word and the Sacrameuts, "we desire to restore to the whole body of Church members its "original position of authority."

The committee of the Lay Section invite members to study the Report and to say how far in their opinion it gives effect to this declaration.

As the Report is now under consideration by a new committee appointed by the Archbishops, it is desirable that views upon it should be expressed *at the earliest possible moment.* Members are asked to refer to the Memorandum on the Report by the Council of the Churchmen's Union, published in the January number of the *Modern Churchman.* The following points are suggested for consideration :—

As to the Proposals as a whole.

Many of the objects aimed at in the Report might have been attained without legislation, if a greater effort had been made to carry into effect the voluntary organisation, proposals for which were formulated some years ago by the Representative Church Council. As however, for many reasons, the voluntary basis has proved to be impracticable, it seems desirable to impose by statute on clergy and laity

alike, the duty of working an improved organisation for carrying on the operations of the Church. From the criticisms which have appeared in the press, there would seem to be some who are deterred from supporting the scheme by fear that its proposal must lead to Disestablishment. These urge that Parliament is not so unsuitable or unsympathetic a legislating body for the Church as is suggested in the Report, and that the necessity of appealing to it affords protection to minorities in the Church against attempts at permanent change by a possibly transient majority.

As to the fear of Disestablishment, if we attach such significance and value to the established or national character of the Church, that we would rather submit to the sacrifice or modification of the proposed scheme of self-government than lose for the nation and the Church what that character represents, then we ought to say so with no uncertain voice.

As to the protection of Minorities, this could probably be obtained by strengthening (as suggested in the Council's Report) the proposals under which any enactments of the Church Council would have to lie on the table of the Houses of Parliament for a certain time before they could become effective.

Franchise.

The view now appears to be almost generally accepted that Baptism and not Confirmation should be the qualification for a vote. It would be as well however that we as laity should affirm our views on this point.

The Position of Women.

It would seem now to be clear that women are entitled to a position of equality with lay men in the organisation of the Church's work. On this point also it is desirable that the laity should express a definite opinion.

Election.

The only direct election proposed by the Archbishops' Committee is that to the Parochial Councils. The representatives of the parish on the Ruridecanal Council are to be elected by the Parochial Council, those on the Diocesan Conference by the lay representatives on the Ruridecanal Council, and those in the House of Laymen by the lay representatives on the Diocesan Conference. The House of Laymen (one of the three Houses which are together to constitute the legislating Church Council) would by this method be removed by three intervening Councils from contact with and responsibility to the general

body of laity whom they are supposed to represent. In effect also representatives of minorities would be eliminated. We ought to assert emphatically our view that representation in the House of Laymen should be made real. If direct election would be too cumbersome and expensive, then the Parochial Councils, as being nearest to the general body of laity, might be the electorate. Each Council might be allowed to nominate, and the election would then be made by the Councils of the district, each such Council being accorded a number of votes proportionate to the number of electors in the parish. It ought also to be possible to work out a system of proportional representation which would ensure representation of minorities.

Powers of Parochial Councils.

No attempt is made in the proposals of the Report to give statutory powers to Parochial Councils. These Councils are fundamental, and it is in them principally that the laity will be able to take their position as members of the Church. The statute should therefore specify the minimum powers to be allotted to them, liberty being given to the Church Council to enlarge these. According to the Report it appears to be contemplated that the powers of Parochial Councils, even on questions of finance, should be limited by the requirement that the Councils are to act "in conjunction with the incumbent." The effect must necessarily be to give the incumbent the ultimate effectual control. Such powers would be nugatory or futile. In financial matters the Parochial Council should have complete control. The Parochial Councils should also, instead of being confined to the making of "representations" or "complaints," as suggested in the Report, be allowed a right of veto on any change in church services, ritual, or ornaments, and on any alterations in the church fabric, and should have a similar right of veto in the appointment of an incumbent. Unless the Parochial Councils are clothed with positive powers of such a nature as these, the position of member of the Council will have no attraction for the laity.

On the points above set out the committee would like to have answers to the following questions :—

1. Do you desire a scheme of organisation on the general lines of the Report to be made Statutory?

2. In your opinion should the proposals be carried forward even at the risk of Disestablishment?

3. Do you consider that Baptism should be the qualification for a Vote?

4. Do you consider that Women should have equal privileges with men in the proposed organisation?

5. Are you satisfied with the mode of Election to the House of Laymen proposed in the Report, or have you any suggestion to make?

6. Do you consider that the powers of the Parochial Councils should be defined by Statute?

7. Do you consider the powers proposed by the Archbishops' Committee to be conferred on Parochial Councils would be adequate? If not, what suggestions do you make?

The committee will also be glad to receive comments or criticism of other features of the Report.

Resolutions and expressions of opinion should be sent not later than 24th May to one of the Hon. Secs. of the Lay Section:—

WM. B. GORDON, *Chairman.*

CYRIL NORWOOD, *Vice-Chairman.*

DORA NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley,
LLEWELLYN PREECE, 8 Queen Anne's Gate, S.W. } *Hon. Secs.*

April 15, 1918.

HEMSLEY & SONS, PRINTERS, ILKLEY.

PRELIMINARY

Fifth Conference of Modern Churchmen

CAMBRIDGE

August 5——12, 1918

Conference Committee—

Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D., F.B.A.

P. H. Bagenal, O.B.E.
The Dean of Carlisle
Rev. Cyril Emmet, B.D.
Rev. J. Gamble, B.D.
Rev. Canon Glazebrook, D.D.
Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D.
Mrs. Major
Rev. C. Moxon, M.A.
Mrs. Moxon
Miss D. Nussey
Mrs. Reith

The Conference this year will be held at Cambridge, where by the kindness of the authorities, Girton College has again been placed at the disposal of the Committee.

The Conference will begin on *Monday afternoon, Aug. 5th*, and will close on *Monday morning, Aug. 12th*. The programme proper will end on *Saturday, the 10th*, but it is thought that two extra days would be appreciated by those able to afford the time.

The charge for tickets will be advertised later.

The general subject will be *The Psychology of Religious Experience*, and the Conference will be opened by a presidential address on The Psychological Basis of Religion. The subjects chosen for the morning sessions are :—The Psychology of Sin, of Repentance and Forgiveness, of Conversion and Saintliness, the Practice of Devotion and its Psychological Value, the Psychology of Public Worship and Christian Fellowship. The subjects for the evening sessions are :—The Validity of the Argument from Religious Experience, the Psychology of Inspiration, the Religious Experience of Youth and Age, the Psychology of the Christian Motive, the Witness of the Heart to Christ. At Evensong addresses will be given on (among others) Clement of Alexandria, Thomas à Kempis, Pascal, Carlyle, treated as types of the religious life.

The following have already promised to read papers :—The Dean of Carlisle, Prof. A. A. Cock, Rev. Principal Dewick, Miss Dougall, Rev. C. W. Emmet, Prof. Gardner, Mrs. C. W. Graham, Prof. Granger, Prof. Jevons, Rev. C. Moxon, Rev. W. C. Roberts, Mr. K. Saunders, Dr. F. R. Tennant, Rev. E. Milner White.

Addresses in chapel will be given by Rev. A. Fawkes, Miss Alice Gardner, Rev. H. Handley, Mr. A. H. Peppin, Mr. Nowell Smith, Dr. Tollinton, and others.

The Conference will be open to members of the Churchmen's Union, and to those who are in sympathy with its principles and objects.

Hon. Secretary—Dora Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley.
Hon. Press Secretary—P. H. Bagenal, Harrogate.

HEMSLEY & SONS, PRINTERS, ILKLEY.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION

LAY SECTION

Members and Associates of the Churchmen's Union who have not already done so, are invited to signify their approval of the movement by signing and sending in this slip, so that their names may be entered as Members of the Section. Sympathisers who are not members are invited to join both the Union and the Lay Section.

The minimum subscription to the Union is 5/- per annum, for which the subscriber receives the *Modern Churchman* monthly. The additional minimum subscription to the Lay Section is 2/6, payable in January.

Committee—

Mr. F. H. Anson
Prof. Sir W. Ashley
Mr. P. H. Bagenal
Hon. G. Coleridge
Miss L. Dougall
Mr. W. B. Gordon (*Chairman*)
Mr. H. G. Hart
Hon. Mrs. Matheson
Dr. Cyril Norwood (*Vice-Chairman*)
Mrs. Reith
Mr. P. Williams

Miss Dora Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley
Mr. Llewellyn Preece, 8 Queen Anne's Gate, S.W. } *Hon. Secretaries.*

I approve the resolution of the Council for the formation of a *Lay Section* of the *Churchmen's Union*, and I agree that the lay members of the Council and others whom they may co-opt shall be a committee to carry out the arrangements.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Date.....

Hemsley & Sons, Printers, Ilkley.

	Page
A Great Primate	1
Labour and the Church	10
Towards Christian Unity	15
The Reader in the Early Church	18
Women and the Church	25
A Famous War Sermon	35
Reviews—An Episcopal Appeal to Conscience	40
The Church in the Furnace	42
An Apology for the National Church	44
Correspondence—A Practical Proposal	47
The Bishop of Salisbury's Action	47

CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

THE LONDON GATHERING.

ANNUAL SERVICE AND MEETINGS,
Thursday, June 27th, 1918.

12-0 **Holy Communion** in Christ Church, Westminster (by kind permission of the Vicar). Preacher: The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

3 p.m. The **Annual General Meeting of Members** in Caxton Hall, Westminster.

5 p.m. **Tea.**

5-30 p.m. **Public Meeting** in Caxton Hall.

Speakers:

Dr. Macan, Master of University College, Oxford.
Rev. Harold Anson, M.A.
Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

Nominations for the Council.—The Secretary wishes to remind members of the Churchmen's Union that any two members may nominate one or more candidates for election to the Council. Nominations must reach the Secretary not later than May 1st. There are ten vacancies, and any member of the Union is eligible for election except the ten retiring Council members.

not devoid of the shrewdness of that nation. He was also ready to accept advice from other men.

This does not mean that he never made mistakes. It is not improbable that he afterwards regretted signing the episcopal manifesto condemning *Essays and Reviews*; but he was not one of those who avoid definite blunders solely by never making up their minds to do anything to commit themselves.

"So far as your own side of the question is concerned," wrote the Apostle, "live at peace with all men." Without any sacrifice of principle, this was Tait's attitude throughout his London Episcopate and his Primacy. Nor was it an easy one to maintain for twenty-six years with a series of vexatious controversies to distract the peace of the Church and Nation.

Beside the personal interest of Queen Victoria, it was perhaps the assurance that Tait possessed in a high degree the qualities indispensable to a leader of men, as proved by his highly successful work upon the difficult University Commission of 1850-2, that induced Palmerston to offer him the See of London in 1856. It was an almost unprecedented appointment; only once during the previous two centuries had any man, not already a bishop, been selected. Nor was Tait very widely known outside Oxford and Rugby circles.

A bishop's throne must ever be one of the least comfortable of official positions, but in the middle of the last century it was perhaps exceptionally trying. Party strife was raging with more than its usual ferocity, and continued with little intermission during Tait's tenure of office. He, however, approached his difficult task in a spirit of deep humility. His private diary runs:—

> "O Lord, grant that thy Church may take no injury through my fault. Give me vigilance over myself first, next over others . . . Give me wisdom—give me holiness—give me strength of mind and body—give me kind consideration for the feelings of all around me—give me boldness—give me decision. . . . May I undertake this office in the spirit of a missionary. Soon I shall be called to give account."

The new bishop, in the face of a somewhat unpromising outlook, had little patience with those who sing in a minor key.

Towards the end of a long life he remarked that ever since his boyhood he had heard that the Church of England had been passing through a crisis, and he added:—

> "And I believe it has, but it has got out of those crises, and it will get out of all others. In point of fact, this is nothing more than is true of every good institution throughout the world:"

It often calls for some philosophy to see beyond the temporary disputes of rival factions, the slow process of development; but Tait was ready to make that venture of faith; and, like the valiant Teucer, he saw better days in store, and did not fear to launch away.

O fortes, pejoraque passi
Mecum saepe viri, . . .
Cras ingens iterabimus aequor.[1]

In his primary London Charge, to the delight of his friends and to the surprise of the outside world, he avoided the "elaborate and studied inanity" which generally characterised the episcopal utterances of that day, and approached with candour the problems that modern conditions had thrust upon the Church. He was practically the first Bishop of London to recognise how inadequate were the provisions made for the religious needs of the metropolis. He not only set on foot a fund for building new churches, organised a Diocesan Home Mission, and inaugurated "The Bishop of London's Fund," but held services in theatres, halls, and in the open-air, preaching to ragged-school children, costermongers, omnibus drivers, railway porters, and other miscellaneous audiences. Indeed, the "undignified and almost Methodist proceedings" of their bishop were not observed without misgiving by some of the straiter Pharisees of the time.

It was his respect for their practical work among the masses that disposed Tait to extend his sympathies towards many of his Tractarian clergy, with whom, perhaps, in other respects he had little in common. He discouraged the tempest of intolerance which their injudicious practices had occasionally

[1] Horace *Odes* i. 7. Quoted by Stanley in his preface to *Essays in Church and State*.

aroused against them, and had no mind to cast them to the lions of the then dominant Evangelical Party. It was not until Tait became Archbishop, when the Public Worship Act (since that time become largely a dead letter) was passed, that he provoked the hostility of the High Church party—and even then he was saving them from a worse fate; public opinion having risen so high that Parliament (voiced by Lord Shaftesbury and backed by the Evangelicals) could, with difficulty, be restrained from obtaining, or, at any rate, from demanding, their full pound of flesh in the shape of legal enactments of the most relentless description.

It is probable that Tait's reputation as a statesman was largely made by his masterly conduct of the Irish Church Bill, at the beginning of his Primacy. To discuss the merits and history of that measure is not our intention. It will suffice to recall that the matter was one of great difficulty. Parliamentary opinion was very strongly set in favour of the measure, and Gladstone's strong majority had been the result of an election fought upon that very issue. Tait was wise enough to see that the fight must be one for terms; and it was his conciliatory attitude that eventually secured conditions highly favourable to the Irish Church. Many times his plans were within an ace of complete failure, but his patience, candour, and tact carried the matter through to a triumphant conclusion. Archbishop Trench, of Dublin, as representative of the Irish Bishops, when the Act was *un fait accompli*, wrote as follows:—

> "All Irish Churchmen, if they are not vulgarly thankless, will keep a most grateful memory of all that you did, and sought to do, in aid of our Establisment while it was passing through the crisis of its fate, and I, with those others who were the immediate witnesses of your efforts, will keep the most grateful record of them all."

The heavy strain of these months told heavily upon Tait, never a strong man since his illness at Rugby long before. The Bill passed in July, and in November a paralytic seizure ensued; for a period his life was despaired of, and for some months it seemed that his active work was over. He rallied,

however, and was soon involved in another controversy which is said to have shaken the Church to its foundations.

That venerable document, so endeared to the affections of Anglican dogmatists, the Athanasian Creed, was now the apple of discord. In the early years of the century, more than half the parishes in England are said to have been unaccustomed to its recitation. But the rise of the Tractarian Party (a faction more remarkable for doctrinal zeal than for sound historical knowledge) has coincided with an increased clerical insistence upon the recitation of a formula which for eight or nine centuries "was never heard in the services of the Church, and was first introduced as a part of monastic devotion in the thickest darkness of the Middle Ages."[2]

Many of the clergy were not disinclined to admit the necessity for some change, either in the rubric enjoining the Creed's recitation, or by the addition of an "explanatory" rubric, or by the omission of those clauses which gave offence to charitable Christians, or by the relegation of the document to an Appendix to the Prayer-Book. The Archbishop himself sympathised with this last proposal, but he was too well acquainted with the invincible nature of clerical prejudices to suppose that so reasonable a course would give satisfaction. According to his principle, therefore, that a half reform is better than no reform at all, he proceeded to seek for a compromise. The difficulties in the way of an agreement were not lessened by the action of some of the Tractarian party (notably Liddon and Pusey) who brandished menaces of secession if their particular views were neglected.[3]

The debates in the Lower House of Convocation were typical of that assembly, and did little to clear the air. Panic-stricken clergy wrote extravagant appeals to Lambeth conjuring the Primate as he "hoped for mercy in his dying hour," to preserve the Church from ruin. The "religious" press joined

[2] Thirlwall's *Remains*, vol. II., p. 328.

[3] For Tait's correspondence with Liddon, see Davidson's *Life of Tait*, vol. II., pp. 137-ff.

in the tumult with its usual vigour, indiscretion, and scurrility. The situation was saved by the action of the Bishops and the attitude of many men of education and standing among the clergy; and after three years of agitation, a declaration was agreed upon by the two Houses of Convocation which did something to allay the scandal that the Creed was causing among the laity.[4]

The satisfaction that this ambiguous statement was able to provide was (as had been expected) imperfect. One High Church leader wrote to the public press that he was "constrained to reckon among the Church's foes" so pusillanimous a Primate. Liberals, on the other hand, deplored the paltry expedient of an "explanatory" declaration, as being likely to rivet more firmly the fetters that remained.

> "There it stands, and there, thanks to this waste of an opportunity, it will go on standing until it carries off the other two Creeds upon its back, was the comment of Dean Stanley."

If we allude to another painful controversy, we shall only do so as an example of a case where Tait felt no compromise to be possible.

The Burials controversy displayed a poverty of Christian charity hardly credible to anyone unacquainted with the hard consistency of sacerdotal logic, which makes up for questionable premises by very rigorous methods of deduction. The question that vexed the Church was the vital one whether Christian Nonconformists should be allowed to claim the right of using English churchyards to hold services at the gravesides of their brethren. In this matter Tait was adamant. The line he took in the House of Lords is clearly indicated by the following quotation from one of the speeches there:—

> "The English Church is a National Church, wide as the nation, ready to embrace all in the nation who are anxious to join it, and not making narrow sectarian distinctions."

[4] The declaration stated that the Creed "doth not make any addition to the faith as contained in Holy Scripture, but warneth against errors which from time to time have arisen in the Church of Christ." And that "the Church in this confession doth declare the necessity for all who would be in a state of salvation of holding fast the Catholic faith, and the great peril of rejecting the same."

He knew that the Nonconformists were asking no more than a moral right, which no clerical obstruction could long prevent from becoming a legal one.

In his Charge of 1880 Tait expressed the hope that the new measure would "serve to strengthen the Church by removing a most painful cause of controversy, and uniting with us more closely in death those whom circumstances alienated from the Church of their fathers." These are the words of a genuine "father in God."

The Archbishop, idealist as he was, must often, one would have thought, have felt weary of life. As Stanley put it in Convocation in 1879:—

> "For seven years, Convocation, passing by many important reforms which are anxiously awaited by the Church, has been engaged upon the subject of clergymen's clothes. When we hear this spoken of as one of the essentials of religion it shows to what a low pitch our religion has sunk."

Maurice might well speak of the essential atheism to which the Church bore witness.

And yet, as we have already seen, Tait was an optimist. A few years before he died, he said:—

> "Any honest man who compares the facts of to-day with those of twenty-four years ago, must acknowledge that, all along the line, there has been a steady, though a gradual, improvement, and looking to God's goodness in the past, there is every reason to anticipate a happy future. I honestly believe that by the blessing of Almighty God the Church of to-day will hand on its heritage unimpaired to the generations which are yet unborn."

Tait's Charges always breathed this spirit. It was no flatterer who wrote:—

> "His words are like a battle-cry, so stirring and generous, and withal so true and real and wise. Amid the ignorance, superstition, and pettiness, of so many so-called leaders, what a joy it is to get such a challenge as his, and to follow him in the path of the Church's true and inevitable future—so far at least as one has strength and faithfulness."

Si Pergama dextra
Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent.

The present Primate, in his life of his father-in-law, gives many interesting personal details, of which, in his capacity as

private chaplain, he was able to take note. A studied calmness, a quick sense of humour, an innate kindliness were his most characteristic qualities. His sympathies were wide, he had few prejudices, and though he had a considerable belief in the dignity of office, he had no great faith in ecclesiastical pretensions. He was furthermore deeply and genuinely religious, and he thought it the weakest point in the Liberals, with whom he himself had so much in common, that they too often fell short in that respect:—

> "What is wanted is a deeply religious liberal party. The great evil is that the liberals are deficient in religion, and the religious are deficient in liberality."

Upon the news of Maurice's death in 1872, he writes:—

> "Who is to fill the place that Frederick Maurice has left vacant? Alas! the younger Broad Churchmen have not the depth of his piety. Speculation without love or light is a very different thing from the tone of mind which he fostered. I know of none of the school who has his depth of piety."

It is perhaps true that the younger Broad Churchmen were driven into a studied negligence of external piety of demeanour and speech by the spectacle of pseudo-sanctity which so many adherents of the Tractarian and Evangelical schools presented to the world.

> "And when ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites. . . . Verily I say unto you, they have received their reward."

The charge has not seldom been brought against Tait both in his own day, and since that time, of having been a "trimmer." The variety of reasons for which divergent schools from time to time have voiced this calumny is probably sufficient proof (if any were required) of its absurdity.

Tait did not always think it consistent with statemanship to carry through his own particular policy in every individual crisis that arose, yet he never left the public in doubt as to what his own views actually were.

In the eyes of the judicious, the systematic vilification that the clerical press kept up against him, might seem the soundest guarantee of Tait's sincerity and wisdom.

We cannot forbear to quote from one ingenious passage in the *Church Times* of June 15th, 1877. Tait is there described as "an antagonist who is entirely callous and unscrupulous, and quite as willing to strike with secret dagger from behind, as to strike with sword in front." He is said to be "profoundly unacquainted with all that belongs to the theological, historical, and spiritual side of the Church of England." This, of course, is merely silly, but the peroration is libellous: "What music is to a man with no ear, that religion is to Archbishop Tait, and it is as idle to argue with him on religious questions, and on religious grounds, as it would be to play a pathetic composition of Mendelssohn's to a musically deaf person." Not without good cause did F. D. Maurice speak of "the immoral and godless domination of anonymous religious journalism."—(*Vide* Davidson's *Life*, vol. II., pp. 571-572).

It is a mark of Tait's magnanimity that he gave way neither to petulance nor to cynicism. A sense of humour lightened his task to the end, and a considerable knowledge of and interest in human nature led him to regard his captious critics as interesting phenomena, well worth the consideration that every intelligent man pays to the curious and the remarkable. He suffered fools (as an acute writer has hinted)[5] "if not gladly, at least with equanimity," and probably was well aware, with the Hebrew sage, that "Though thou shouldest bray a fool in a mortar with a pestle among bruised corn, yet will not his foolishness depart from him." *Indolem virilem cum simplici pietate conjunxit*, wrote Temple for his memorial in Rugby Chapel. Simple piety and a manly genius are not always found in conjunction; less often, at any rate, in those of high ecclesiastical station, than the welfare of the Church demands.

"The mind is the man," said Cromwell; and it was because Tait had a mind that could comprehend the unity behind conflicting parties, and see in their diversity the "broad eternal elements in human nature," that he could be tolerant and conciliatory. Latitude did not, in his case, mean lack of principle; it meant generosity and practical compromise.

J. C. Hardwick.

[5] Mr. Fawkes' article in the *Modern Churchman*, May, 1914.

LABOUR AND THE CHURCH.

Labor omnia vincit. Such is the inspiring motto of a great industrial city of the North of England. The future may give to that motto an added significance; for Labour, in a political sense, bids fair to win both office and power. Its avowed aim[1] is to make "the Democratic control of society in all its activities" the foundation of "the Pillars of the House" which it proposes to erect; and if "each brick that it helps to lay" is shaped by considerations of what is practical, just, and economically sound, Bradford's motto may come to be the expression of the measure of its triumph.

What will be the attitude of a Labour Government to the established Church? Upon this question the Report already cited is silent. It is true that the policy of Labour will involve a large extension of the principle of State control with which, it may be said, Parliamentary control of an established Church is not inconsistent. But is it not equally true that Labour will be opposed to Privilege, and that the working classes are largely indifferent, if not hostile, to the Churches generally? Addressing a gathering of clergy recently Mr. William Adamson, M.P., the Chairman of the Labour Party, said:—

> "Many among the labouring classes are sick of the whole thing, and take up the position, 'a plague on you and your Church,' and yet they are not really antagonistic to the Gospel."[2]

A distinguished Liberal Churchman, writing of the Anglican Church, has said:—

> "The proletariate of the great cities is precisely the element that has least sympathy with her. She has looked on while the working people have drifted away from her. That she can ever recall them to her communion is doubtful. But what is quite certain is that her only

[1] *Labour and the new Social Order.* A Report on Reconstruction. Published by the Labour Party, 1, Victoria Street, S.W.

[2] Reported in the *Record*, 7th March, 1918.

chance of again attracting them lies in a complete change in her ways, her organisation, and her teaching."[8]

Such considerations suggest a policy of disestablishment.

Even so, it need not be assumed that Labour will be animated by vindictive motives. No such motives appear in the Report on Reconstruction, the authors of which plead for their programme in the interests of the community as a whole. They say in terms: "We are members one of another. No man liveth to himself alone." And they add that this truth "will be the guiding principle of any Labour Government." As a pledge of good faith the Labour Party has taken the profoundly significant step of broadening the basis of its membership so that those engaged both in mental and manual work may have fellowship one with another in a common cause. These words and this act suggest that the Church policy of Labour will be based on justice rather than animus.

But before a fiat for disestablishment issues, it might be worth while for Labour to re-consider the question of the relations of Church and State in the light of its own ideals. If Labour "calls for more warmth in politics," and "Democratic Co-operation in all fields of life," can it afford to ignore the influences which would tend to raise Democratic Co-operation to the power of Christian brotherhood? Co-operation may be attained from motives of self interest alone. These, however, cannot supply the warmth, sympathy, and consciousness of high purpose which derive from the Reason and Source of all true brotherhood, who, as Labour will remember, was Himself a Carpenter. This Working Man founded a Society or Union to promote, by spiritual means, the very brotherhood which Labour claims as its high ideal. And this Society still exists. True it is largely ineffective by reason of its denial of the very unity and fellowship which should be the law of its being; and nowhere more so than in England where, from time immemorial, there has been a national Branch of this Society. National

[8] Professor Percy Gardner. Quoted in the *Modern Churchman*, Feb., 1918, p. 586.

indeed no longer in any true sense of the term, and rent by internal dissidence, but still preserving in its ancient constitution and its historic connection with the State those distinctive features, culminating in the lay control of Parliament, which it has inherited from the political genius of the English nation.[4]

Are there no possibilities of re-construction here? Will Labour refuse to consider whether, *under new conditions*, the established Branch of this Society might not exercise a potent influence in promoting national brotherhood, and, to use the admirable words of Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw, "the purification and exaltation of the Democratic National State" upon which "rests the one hope of the salvation of Britain and the Empire."[5] A Christian Society which should become "the indwelling and directing conscience of the people"[6] and the State's perpetual Remembrancer of the things that pertain to its highest welfare would surely fulfil this high calling. To this end the condition precedent is that the Society or Church shall be truly national, and not nominally national but practically sectarian. It must become the spiritual home of the English people; and therefore comprehensive enough to include all that is not alien to the spirit of English Christianity.

But, it will be asked, how shall this be seeing that in the Church itself, to a large extent, there is no vision? Has not the great refusal already been made by the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State? The terms of reference laid before this important Committee would, as the Committee admit, have justified an investigation into "the methods by which the national recognition of religion might find more adequate expression and the Church become more fully the organ of the spiritual life of the nation."[7] When, however, the Committee reported in 1916, after two years of the War, it appeared that they had deliberately rejected this great and inspiring task, and had contented themselves with devising an amazing

[4] cf. *The Genius of the English Church*. A. Fawkes, p. 111. [5] *Freedom in Service*, p. 95.
[6] ibid, p. 96. [7] Report (S.P.C.K.), p. 2.

scheme of ecclesiastical autonomy as the panacea for the ills of the Church. Of this it must suffice to say here that in the present temper of ecclesiastics and their lay satellites, many of whom are permeated with the heresy-hunting spirit of the middle ages, and whose pretensions, within the Church and at the expense of the State, have been steadily growing, such a scheme will yield neither life nor liberty, and will consequently do nothing to promote national brotherhood within a national Church. What hinders this is not the defects of a machine which Parliament is quite competent to remedy, but something far more serious which requires radical treatment. Such treatment has been necessary at various crises in English history when the State, acting through Crown or Parliament, has had to take strong measures with the Church. The bold experiment of direct State action may accordingly be commended to Labour, if Labour desires to see whether a really National Church is possible. The necessary action would be drastic; but it would be in accordance with the precedent of the Reformation which, in the striking words of the late Professor Gwatkin, "was not carried out with the assent of the Church, but the State took the Church in hand and reformed it against its will."[8] Let the State disallow within the established Church the particular ecclesiastical dogma which prevents the religious unity of Protestant England, and therefore the foundation of a truly National Church. This is the dogma of Apostolical Succession, sometimes expressed in the phrase "No Bishop, no Church." Here lies the root of the evil. Let the laity in Parliament, asserting their competence in matters of faith,[9] cut it out as by a surgeon's knife; for if the State could disallow the Mass it can disallow Apostolical Succession. "The clergy," as Gibbon says, "may smile or groan at the presumption of a layman who defines the articles of faith; yet if he stoops to the humiliating task, his mind is less infected by prejudice or interest."[10] With this deadly

[8] *Church and State in England to the death of Queen Anne*, p. 224.
[9] Ibid. [10] *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 47.

incubus eliminated, and all the phenomena of exclusive sacerdotalism which it entails, a new day would dawn for English Christianity. Then would swing open the flood-gates through which the healing streams of fellowship and inter-communion would flow. Then could the men of good-will, Episcopalian and non-Episcopalian, come together to undo the mischief wrought by the seventeenth century passion for uniformity at the expense of unity. Would there not result a re-constructed Church, from which episcopal and clerical autocracy would be swept away, but in which, with the retention of a reasonable Episcopacy, there would be consummated the great ideal of unity amid diversity? Christian unity thus achieved within a National Church would surely liberate those spiritual forces which cannot issue from a divided and therefore impotent Church, which would profoundly influence "Democratic Co-operation" within the State; and which would give to the union of Church and State a new and deeper significance and vitality. Is this a vain and hopeless ideal? It is not for the authors of the Report on Reconstruction to say so, for they state that "to-day no man dares to say that anything is impracticable."

If Labour has faith in this assertion, and in that brotherhood which is the necessary fruit of membership in the Union of the Nazarene Workman, not as it is but as He meant it to be, then let Labour dismiss the inevitable clamour of ecclesiastics and, by direct State action, smite a pathway not for disestablishment but for the re-establishment of a united Church of the English people. So might Church and State grow together in the knowledge of the will of the Master Builder without Whose aid in erecting "the Pillars of the House" they labour in vain that build it.

H. F. Walker.

TOWARDS CHRISTIAN UNITY.

The English sub-committee, consisting of Anglicans and Nonconformists, constituted in connection with the coming World Conference on Faith and Order, has issued a second interim report, which we here publish in full.

In issuing our Second Interim Report we desire to prevent possible misconceptions regarding our intentions. We are engaged, not in formulating any basis of reunion for Christendom, but in preparing for the consideration of such a basis at the projected Conference on Faith and Order. We are exploring the ground in order to discover the ways of approach to the questions to be considered that seem most promising and hopeful. In our first Report we were not attempting to draw up a creed for subscription, but desired to affirm our agreement upon certain foundation truths as the basis of a spiritual and rational creed and life for all mankind in Christ Jesus the Lord. It was a matter of profound gratitude to God that we found ourselves so far in agreement. No less grateful were we that even as regards matters relating to Order we were able to hold certain common convictions, though in regard to these we were forced to recognise differences of interpretation. We feel deeply, however, that we could not let the matter rest there; but that we must in conference seek to understand one another better, in order to discover if even on the questions on which we seemed to differ most we might not come nearer to one another.

1.—In all our discussions we were guided by two convictions from which we could not escape, and would not, even if we could.

It is the purpose of our Lord that believers in Him should be one visible society, and this unity is essential to the purpose of Christ for His Church and for its effective witness and work in the world. The conflict among Christian nations has brought home to us with a greater poignancy the disastrous results of the divisions which prevail among Christians, inasmuch as they have hindered that growth of mutual understanding which it should be the function of the Church to foster, and because a Church which is itself divided cannot speak effectively to a divided world.

The visible unity of believers which answers to our Lord's purpose must have its source and sanction, not in any human arrangements, but in the will of the One Father, manifested in the Son, and effected through the operation of the Spirit; and it must express and maintain the fellowship of His people with one another in Him. Thus the visible unity of the Body of Christ is not adequately expressed in the co-operation of the Christian Churches for moral influence and social service, though such co-operation might with great advantage be carried much further than it is at present; it could only be fully realised through community of worship, faith, and order, including common participation in the Lord's Supper. This would be quite compatible with a rich diversity in life and worship.

2.—In suggesting the conditions under which this visible unity might be realised, we desire to set aside for the present the abstract discussion of the origin of the Episcopate historically, or its authority doctrinally; and to secure for that discussion when it comes, as it must come, at the Conference, an atmosphere congenial not to controversy, but to agreement, This can be done only by facing the actual situation in order to discover if any practical proposals could be made that would bring the Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Communions nearer to one another. Further, the proposals are offered not as a basis for immediate action, but for the sympathetic and generous consideration of all the Churches.

The first fact which we agree to acknowledge is that the position of Episcopacy in the greater part of Christendom as the recognised organ of the unity and continuity of the Church, is such that the members of the Episcopal Churches ought not to be expected to abandon it in assenting to any basis of reunion.

The second fact which we agree to acknowledge is that there are a number of Christian Churches not accepting the Episcopal order which have been used by the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints. They came into being through reaction from grave abuses in the Church at the time of their origin, and were led in response to fresh apprehensions of divine truth to give expression to certain types of Christian experience, aspiration, and fellowship, and to secure rights of the Christian people which had been neglected or denied.

In view of these two facts, if the visible unity so much desired within the Church, and so necessary for the testimony and influence of the Church in the world is ever to be realised, it is imperative that the Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Communions shall approach one another not by the method of human compromise, but in correspondence with God's own way of reconciling differences in Christ Jesus. What we desire to see is not grudging concession, but a willing acceptance for the common enrichment of the united Church of the wealth distinctive of each.

Looking as frankly and as widely as possible at the whole situation, we desire, with a due sense of responsibility, to submit for the serious consideration of all the parts of a divided Christendom what seems to us the necessary conditions of any possibility of reunion:—

1.—That continuity with the historic Episcopate should be effectively preserved.

2.—That in order that the rights and responsibilities of the whole Christian community in the government of the Church may be adequately recognised, the Episcopate should re-assume a constitutional form, both as regards the method of the election of the bishop as by clergy and people, and the method of government after election. It is perhaps necessary that we should call to mind that such was the primitive ideal and practice of Episcopacy and it so remains in many Episcopal communions to-day.

3.—That acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy and not any theory as to its character should be all that is asked for. We think that this may be

the more easily taken for granted as the acceptance of any such theory is not now required of ministers of the Church of England. It would no doubt be necessary before any arrangement for corporate reunion could be made to discuss the exact functions which it may be agreed to recognise as belonging to the Episcopate, but we think this can be left to the future.

The acceptance of Episcopacy on these terms should not involve any community in the necessity of disowning its past, but should enable all to maintain the continuity of their witness and influence as heirs and trustees of types of Christian thought, life and order, not only of value to themselves but of value to the Church as a whole. Accordingly we hope and desire that each of these Communions would bring its own distinctive contribution, not only to the common life of the Church, but also to its methods of organisation, and that all that is true in the experience and testimony of the uniting Communions would be conserved to the Church. Within such a recovered unity we should agree in claiming that the legitimate freedom of prophetic ministry should be carefully preserved; and in anticipating that many customs and institutions which have been developed in separate communities may be preserved within the larger unity of which they have come to form a part.

We have carefully avoided any discussion of the merits of any polity, or any advocacy of one form in preference to another. All we have attempted is to show how re-union might be brought about, the conditions of the existing Churches and the convictions held regarding these questions by their members being what they are. As we are persuaded that it is on these lines, and these alone, that the subject can be approached with any prospect of any measure of agreement, we do earnestly ask the members of the Churches to which we belong to examine carefully our conclusions and the facts on which they are based, and to give them all the weight that they deserve.

In putting forward these proposals, we do so because it must be felt by all good-hearted Christians as an intolerable burden to find themselves permanently separated in respect of religious worship and communion from those in whose characters and lives they recognise the surest evidences of the indwelling Spirit; and because, as becomes increasingly evident, it is only as a body, praying, taking counsel, and acting together, that the Church can hope to appeal to men as the body of Christ, that is Christ's visible organ and instrument in the world, in which the Spirit of brotherhood and of love as wide as humanity, finds effective expression.

The Report is signed by the Bishops of Bath and Wells, Winchester, and Oxford, and by the Revs. W. T. Davison, A. E. Garvie, H. L. Goudge, J. Scott Lidgett, W. B. Selbie, J. H. Shakespeare, Eugene Stock, W. Temple, Tissington Tatlow, and H. G. Wood.

We believe that Liberal Churchmen will regard this Second Report as having even greater claims to serious attention than the First Report which dealt mainly with matters of Faith,

and will congratulate the sub-committee most heartily on the result of their labours.

All Liberal Churchmen desire the retention of episcopal government on constitutional lines. It is only exclusive, un-historical, and un-Christian theories of the episcopate and the practices arising therefrom, to which they are opposed.

The Report expresses, in careful terms, the Liberal ideal and policy in this matter.

THE READER IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

There is, we imagine, a certain amount of misunderstanding about the meaning of the word "to read" in several places where it occurs in the New Testament. The only Greek word there used is ἀναγινώσκειν (ἀναγνῶναι), which has to do duty both for "reading to oneself" and "reading aloud," though there was to hand the word ἐντυγχάνειν for "private reading," if the writers had wished to use it.[1]

Nearly all the references to "reading," in either sense, in the New Testament have to do either with the Scriptures or with some public document (*e.g.*, an Epistle) which is to be read in the hearing of or by others; the only exceptions are St. John xix. 20, where many read the title on the cross; Acts xxiii. 34, where a private letter is read; and 2 Cor. iii. 2, where the word "read" is used metaphorically. Of the other cases where the word occurs, the only one in which reading for private study is distinctly alluded to (and still it is the Scriptures that are referred to), is that of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts viii. 28, 30, 32. In the Synoptic Gospels our

[1] It is interesting to note that the former word means originally "to recognise" (*i.e.*, the separate syllables, words, sentences and sense), and the latter "to come across," "to meet with," and so "to handle," "deal with" (like Latin *tractare*), whilst in Latin *legere* means "to pick," "gather," and is generally used for "reading either aloud or to oneself," although *recitare* was available for the former meaning, if it was required.

Lord several times[2] asks His hearers whether they have not read this or that in the Law or in the Scriptures, but the practice of hearing passages of Scripture read in the synagogue on the Sabbath Day (or at school time) is so bound up with His inquiry, that ἀναγνῶναι is almost equivalent there to "having heard read," rather than to "having read for yourselves." Needless to say, copies of the Scriptures were scarce and not easy to read by the ordinary folk in Palestine, if they could read at all; so that in these cases it is not fanciful to say that the idea *is* of "reading aloud" rather than of "reading to oneself." At all events, in several other cases the word must mean that; take for instance the very obvious instances in Acts xiii. 15 and 27; xv. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15; Col. iv. 16; and 1 Thess. v. 27. In the first three of these the reference is to the reading of the Law (Moses) or the Prophets in the synagogue on the Sabbath; in the last two St. Paul gives injunctions about the public reading of what he has written to the assembled Church.

But three other less obvious instances remain. (1) Rev. i. 3, "Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this prophecy." Here the reference is certainly not to the private perusal of the book, but to its being read aloud in the midst of hearers, who are to share the reader's blessing with him.

So again (2) St. Matt. xxiv. 15 (St. Mark xiii. 14), "Let him that readeth understand." This can hardly mean that the reader to himself is to take note of what is written in the book of Daniel on the matter; for no quotation is made from the book. It is a parenthetic insertion, and perhaps an early indication that the passage is derived from a document which was already sometimes read in Christian assemblies before the siege of Jerusalem had occurred, and is therefore an exhortation to the reader aloud that he should, in passing, remind his hearers as to what was shortly coming to pass.

[2] Viz., St. Matt. xii. 3, 5; xix. 4; xxi. 16, 42; xxii. 31. St. Mark ii. 25; xii. 10, 26. St. Luke vi, 3; x. 26. With these passages compare Acts xv. 31; 2 Cor. i. 13; Gal. iv. 21; Eph. iii. 4.

(3) In 1 Tim. iv. 13, the Apostle exhorts St. Timothy to pay attention to reading as well as to exhortation and teaching. It may somewhat surprise some of our readers to be told that what he is to do here is not to give time to his private reading and study of the Scriptures, but to the proper and impressive reading of them aloud at the time of service, whether by himself or some other minister.[8] But there can be little, if any, doubt that that is the force of the injunction.

We are all aware that the Jewish practice of reading passages of scripture aloud to the congregation (for which see Exod. xxiv. 7, and Neh. viii. 3), and then giving an exposition of them was employed by our Lord Himself (as recorded by St. Luke iv. 16), and by His disciples, as in Acts xiii. 15, and xv. 21, and the former of these two passages seems to be a case where, as we gather from other sources, the reader was not always of necessity the interpreter of the passage: it appears as if, after the ordinary official had read, the Apostles were invited to speak on that occasion.

And this practice the early Church soon took over, as we might expect, and introduced it into its own assemblies both for ancient and for recent writings of importance. We have quoted instances already from the New Testament, when this was the case (viz., Acts xv. 31; Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27). But outside the Canon of Scripture, and somewhat later than it, we know that the practice was continued and prevailed. Take for instance a well-known passage in Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 67 (about A.D. 155):—

> "The memoirs of the Apostles, or the compilations of the Prophets are read, as occasion serves (μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ); then, when the reader ceases, the president (ὁ προεστώς) in an address (διά λόγου) gives his comments thereon, and an exhortation to the imitating of these good examples."

Eusebius also (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 23) has preserved for us an extract from a letter of Dionysius of Corinth (before 198)

[8] Of course this is not to say that St. Timothy had not been and was not to continue to be a diligent student of Holy Writ. See 1 Tim. iv. 6; vi. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 15, 16; and above all, iii. 14 ff.

which shows, as he says, that from the first the reading of duly accredited Epistles (in this case St. Clement's to the Corinthians, and a recent letter of Soter's to himself) was the practice of the Church:—

> "We have been keeping the Lord's Day holy to day, and have read your epistle, which we shall continue from time to time to read and comment upon, as we do also with the earlier letter written to us by Clement."

Tertullian again in his treatise *de anima* 9 (about 208) includes the reading of Scripture among the things done at the time of public worship,[4] while in his earlier treatise (? about 199) *de praescriptione* 41, he appears to include the *lector* among the clergy (*clerus*): *hodie diaconus qui cras lector.*

Also about the middle of the third century Orig. *c. Celsum* iii. 50 uses the expression: "inciting men by readings (*δι' ἀναγνωσμάτων*) and by explanations of the passage read," while about the same date St. Cyprian of Carthage has a good deal to say about the Reader's work in the North African Church, *e.g.*, in his Epistles 23, 29, and 39.

Harnack (*Sources of the Apostolic Canons*, Eng. Tran. 1895, pp. 55 ff.) may or may not be right in fixing more or less precisely the date and the way in which the Reader was eventually placed among the clergy, and then only in the Minor Orders, *i.e.*, soon after 222, and not so early as Tertullian's time (as suggested above), but we think he is undoubtedly right in holding that at first the office had a higher position in the Church than later on. He also considers that during the earlier period he was practically a layman, and that his office was charismatic: that again is, we should say, very questionable. Nevertheless the Reader's original importance is undoubted.

The truth is that we, with our clearly printed and easily obtained books, in which the words and sentences are all separated one from the other by spaces and punctuation, can

[4] Compare Ps. Clem. *de Virg.* i. 10: *legere scripturas aut exorcizare aut docere*. here "exorcizing" is substituted for the "exhortation" of I. Tim. iv. 13.

hardly enter into the difficulty of reading in ancient times, and the scarcity of good readers: and we forget the importance of reading aloud for the purposes of either instruction or exhortation. The generality of folk were entirely dependent on the Reader. Even so late as the times of Isidore of Seville (d. 636) it was necessary for him to insist (*de eccl. officiis* ii. 10, 2) that the Reader should be very carefully taught the art of reading the *scriptio continua*,[5] in which MSS. were still written, so as to give the proper sense.

If now, we turn (with Harnack) to the various Church Orders, we find certain illustrations or indications of the Reader's functions and position in the early stages of the Church's development. In what Harnack with great probability considers one of the two original documents, which are the basis of the Apostolic Canons the ἀναγνώστης is named before the Deacons, and it is required that he should be *inter alia:*

> "first thoroughly well approved . . . among the first comers (πρῶτος σύνδρομος) at the Lord's Day assemblies, easy to hear (εὐήκοος) apt to expound (διηγητικός), knowing that he exercises the position of an evangelist" (εὐαγγελιστοῦ τόπον ἐργάζεται: Harnack thinks this may mean "attains to," not "exercises," but this is less likely). "for he that enlightens (*lit.* fills the ears of) one who would not otherwise understand, shall be reckoned as written in God's book" (ἔγγραφος, cf. Ps. lxxix 28).

This description well agrees with what has already been said about him, but further it is noticeable that his powers of expounding as well as of reading aloud give something of the importance of an evangelist (see Eph. iv. ii.; 2 Tim. iv. 5, &c.)

Then there is a very ancient prayer to be used at the Ordination of a Reader which occurs in the Apostolic Constitutions, and contains these remarkable phrases—

> "Look on him who is entrusted with the reading of Thy holy Scriptures to Thy people, and give him the Holy Spirit, the spirit of prophecy (πνεῦμα προφητικόν). Thou that didst grant wisdom to Ezra Thy servant for the reading of Thy laws to Thy people . . . grant wisdom to this Thy servant, &c."

[5] Compare Hermas (at the end of the 2nd cent.) *Vis.* ii. 1, 4; "I rewrote all word for word, because I could not otherwise find the syllables."

This language could hardly be more emphatic, and especially in associating the Reader this time with the προφήτης, not the εὐαγγελιστής (cf. again Eph. iv. 11, where the prophet is mentioned before the Evangelist). The position is further illustrated by another passage in the Apostolic Constitutions (ii. 28), where an account is given of the share which each grade of the clergy is to receive out of the treasury; as to the Reader it runs thus:—"If also he is a Reader, let him also receive a share on the Prophets' scale" (μοῖραν εἰς τιμὴν προφητῶν),[6] which again clearly associates him with the Christian Prophets.

Yet one more striking fact is to be noticed, viz., that in spite of the Ignatian dictum (*ad. Smyrn.* viii. 1):—"Let no one perform any act concerning the Church apart from the Bishop," yet the oldest part of the Apostolic Canons distinctly recognizes the possibility of an illiterate Bishop; he should have a due share of knowledge (παιδείας μέτοχος) and be able to interpret the scriptures; but if he is without education (ἀγράμματος), he must be mild and so forth, as a Reader; and even ἀναλφάβητος (unacquainted with the A.B.C.) is applied to him elsewhere, while actual instances of such Bishops, chiefly no doubt in rural districts, occur in Church History. So long as that was so, the importance of the Reader to the Church was indeed real. Gradually, however, all that was altered, and he was relegated to the lower ranks of the clergy,[7] and finally disappeared as a separate Church officer altogether.

Of late years the Church of England has done something to restore the Reader's office among the laity, so that he may be a useful assistant to the parish priest in large or scattered parishes. It is doubtful, however, whether sufficient stress is usually laid on his ancient qualifications for the office: and

[6] In the Greek version of the Syriac *Didascalia* ii. 20 the words "as the presbyters" are substituted for "a share," while the words "on the Prophets' scale" are represented by nothing now in the Syriac text. The significance of this is doubtful, but Harnack's explanation seems to the present writer neither convincing nor even quite clear.

[7] Epiphanius *Panarion, Expos. Fidei* c. 20 (between 374 and 376):—"The reader is not a priest but as it were a scribe of the word"; cf. St. Matt. xiii. 52 (Every scribe that has become a disciple for the kingdom of heaven).

perhaps still more doubtful whether the art of reading is properly attended to and cultivated even amongst the priests and deacons of the Church themselves. Many advanced men appear to think that rapidity and indistinctness of utterance is essential to the due performance of the public offices; and even those who would disagree with them over that, too often neglect some of the other elements of good reading and speaking in public.

It would be well for us all in fact to lay to heart the excellent instructions given in the *Rubricae generales* of the Roman Missal (xxi. 2):—

> "*Sacerdos maxime curare debet ut ea quae clara voce dicenda sunt, distincte et apposite proferat, non admodum festinanter ut advertere possit quae legit; nec nimis morose ne audientes taedio afficiat; neque voce tam submissa ut a circumstantibus audiri non possit; sed mediocri et gravi quae et devotionem moveat et audientibus ita sit accommodata ut quae leguntur, intelligant.*"

Which may be rendered thus:—

> "The Priest should take the greatest care to pronounce what is to be said aloud, distinctly and effectively; not very quickly, that he may pay heed to what he reads; nor yet too monotonously lest he be wearisome to the hearers; nor in so low a voice that he cannot be heard by those who stand near, but in a moderate and grave voice which may both promote devotion and be so accommodated to the hearers that they may understand what is read."

There is a striking parallel to this passage in George Herbert's *Priest to the Temple,* chap. vi.:—

> "His voice is humble, his words treatable and slow; yet not so slow neither as to let the fervency of the supplicant hang and die between speaking; but with a grave liveliness, between fear and zeal, pausing yet pressing, he performs his duty."

And, after all, the rubric in our own Prayer Book is sufficiently explicit:—The Lessons are to "be read distinctly with an audible voice . . . he that readeth so standing and turning himself, as he may best be heard of all such as are present." And a like emphasis is placed on the subject of public prayer by Canon xiv. of 1604:—"The Common Prayer shall be said or sung distinctly and reverently . . . so as the people may be most edified."

C. L. Feltoe.

WOMEN IN THE CHURCH.

By the Rev. Canon Glazebrook, D.D. (late Headmaster of Clifton College).

Women are doing, and have always done, a great deal of valuable work in the service of the Church. They teach the young, they tend the sick, they visit the distressed, they administer charity, and by their faith and sympathy and purity they do much to keep the moral atmosphere wholesome. And yet the Church is not receiving from them the best service which they are able to render. For, in spite of the changes which in the last 1,500 years have revolutionised society, the Church officially maintains the semi-Oriental subjection of women which was inevitable in the first centuries of the Christian era. There are grounds for the complaint, which is heard on many sides, that women are being exploited—that they are expected to do the hard and humble work with neither adequate reward nor the hope of promotion to higher work; that they give their labour and their money, but are not allowed to give their opinion; that they form the bulk of the active membership of the Church, and yet have no share in its Councils. In so far as such complaints are justified, it cannot be denied that many individuals are suffering for lack of opportunity, and the Church is harmed by the loss of the best service of which they are capable. The modern reaction against traditional views of women's position is natural and wholesome. Yet it is not free from the error which has caused much harm in the sphere of education—the assumption that the equality of the sexes involves identity of function. The logical outcome of that assumption, as seen in Plato's Republic, is the destruction of the family and the impoverishment of human society. So, if in the Church women are merely to do the same things as men, their increased activity will bring no enrichment, but deprive the Church of valuable elements which they are now contributing to her life. Therefore, in surveying the present position of women, and making proposals for its improvement, we shall bear in mind the principle that the recognition of equality in value is not only compatible with diversity of function, but actually demands it. This is true not only of action but of thought and feeling. Doctrine and worship have been too much dominated by the mentality of men. The best service women can do is not to emphasise the man's point of view, but to contribute new elements from their own store.

Our subject naturally divides itself into seven heads:—Membership, Teaching, Nursing, Social Service, Preaching, Priesthood, and Finance.

Each of these will be the subject of a short section. Though this method of treatment may involve some repetitions, we think it will on the whole be found convenient.

MEMBERSHIP.

So far as the legal constitution of the Church is concerned, the membership of laymen and women alike may be described as passive. The difference between them hitherto has been that men have more control over money and the influence which money gives, and have votes for Parliament, whose consent is necessary before any changes can be made in Church government. The latter element of difference is now removed by the new reform bill which gives the franchise to women. That is not of great importance so long as Parliament is practically unable to deal with Church questions. But it will acquire great importance if a Bill is brought in conferring a large measure of self government upon the Church. The hearty support of Churchwomen may turn the scale in its favour, and thus initiate a new era in the history of our Church. The essential feature of any such Bill must be the constitution of a Church Council, empowered to deal, subject to Parliamentary sanction, with all the main interests of the Church. Of this Council elected representatives of the laity will certainly be an integral part. Happily there is a general agreement that, if such a new contribution is conferred upon the Church, the Church franchise will be given to women exactly on the same conditions as to men. We need not, therefore, discuss that proposal, but only affirm our hearty concurrence.

The only difference of opinion is on the question whether women should be eligible as representatives on the higher as well as the lower Councils. We are inclined to urge that they should be eligible to all; but that, in view of the preponderence of women voters, some provision should be made to secure that a majority of the representatives in each Council may be men.

TEACHING.

The teaching of children has always been, and must always be, mainly the work of women: and the same is true of the education of girls in all stages. At one time all such teaching was domestic, religious, or charitable. But gradually a teaching profession has grown up. The standard of knowledge having risen very greatly, regular training is required, and the work occupies the teacher's whole energies. Consequently regular and adequate payment is a necessity; and the bodies which can offer such payment are public authorities or large institutions, which are sometimes forbidden and often unwilling to make Church membership a condition of appointment. The many thousands of women who teach in elementary or State secondary schools are much influenced by the general tone of their profession, which is not altogether friendly to the Church: and the Church

does not make any great effort to keep in touch with them. So the drift of circumstance and the lack of recognition combine to deprive the Church of a part of the vast power which women's daily influence gives them over children's minds.

It is true that a great many women do some teaching, not as professional work, but as a service to the Church. Their principal sphere is the Sunday School; but, unhappily, the Sunday School is one of the Church's failures. The difficulty of getting teachers is so great that practically no test of efficiency is applied. Previous instruction, willingness to prepare lessons properly, regularity in attendance, power to maintain order, are all essential to success, and are all left to chance. The teachers are consciously amateurs, and few of them treat the work seriously. Their pupils, accustomed on weekdays to skilful teaching, naturally make comparisons, and treat the amateur at best with tolerance, often with frank contempt. Now and again force of character and intelligence carry a teacher through the early difficulties, and make her a real influence. But there is no formal way of recognising her superiority, or of giving her powers a proper scope. She remains without authority, one among a number of teachers who are mostly failures; whereas she ought to be their leader and instructor. That office is filled by the over-worked vicar, who knows little about teaching; and his weekly preparation class is neither effective nor well attended.

If Sunday Schools are to be anything but a failure, the Church must learn to treat them seriously. To teach in them must be regarded as a privilege and a responsibility, for which some real training is required. There must be some system of recognising good work by promotion to responsible posts. And the clergy must recognise that *responsibility involves a good deal of independence.*

Other branches of work would naturally fall into the hands of the capable teachers, if once they were distinguished. The preparatory classes for teachers, the catechising in children's services, the girls' confirmation classes, could often be much better undertaken by such women than by the clergy. If our present system of Church Schools continues, the same women would naturally be asked to give religious instruction in the day schools. And some of them could take part in the diocesan inspection of religious teaching. For there is plenty of zeal and plenty of capacity among Churchwomen. What is lacking is system, standardisation, and the due recognition of services rendered.

Supposing such a system were created; and a Christian *esprit de corps* grew up among the amateur teachers in any neighbourhood, it would be an obvious advantage for them to be in touch with the professionals. Invited as experts to meet amateurs in the same work, the latter would have much

to give, but also to receive; for in exchange for knowledge and efficiency they would gain a fresh impulse of Christian motive. Thus women's work of teaching would be consecrated and stimulated.

NURSING.

Nursing, the woman's art *par excellence*, has gone through much the same process of evolution as teaching. It has become a profession, to which many women devote their lives. Engaged in the service of the State or of large institutions, the nurse tends to be detached from definite membership of a religious body. Her work cuts her off from that family life which attaches so many to the Church. The nurse who is a Churchwoman, therefore, needs a special recognition and encouragement, which is too often lacking. Most isolated, perhaps, are the district nurses and health visitors. Their work is individual, absorbing, often exhausting. They would welcome advances from Churchwomen, but they cannot seek them. So they are too often neglected; and yet their work gives them an immense power of influence which might be used for the highest purposes.

Side by side with these there must always be a number of amateur nurses. For there are few places where the help of Christian women, who nurse for love and not for pay, is not urgently needed and greatly valued. In this work, as in that of teaching, there is room for better system and higher standards. In that sphere also the friendly meeting of professional and amateur would be for the advantage of both, and would help to secure for the former her due place and recognition in the service of the Church. For what really matters, from the Christian point of view, is not whether the nurse is professional or amateur, not whether she receives pay or gives her services, but whether the motive which inspires her work is the love of God, and of man for His sake.

SOCIAL WORK.

Somewhat similar remarks have to be made about the operations of women in the wide and ill-defined field of what is called social work.

In the first place there is the distinction between the professional and the amateur. Though of recent origin, it is rapidly acquiring first-rate importance. Every year sees the addition of some new class of women who are employed by the State as inspectors, advisers, administrators, to do systematically that which amateurs have done tentatively and sporadically. Churchmen ought to rejoice that the State is doing so much to apply their own principles. They ought, as far as possible, to welcome the workers in these new departments as fellow-workers with themselves. Unfortunately, since the choice of State employées is necessarily independent of religious profession, and some of those chosen are not connected with any Christian Church, there has been a tendency to regard the whole body as outside the sisterhood of

Church workers. No doubt that tendency has been emphasised by the misunderstandings between professional and amateur. The result has been that the Church organisations have neither made it an object to get their own members into such posts, nor take pains to welcome such State employées as show a disposition to unite with them.

Consequently the great bulk of the social work done by women as definite Church work must be described as amateur, and shows the characteristic defects of amateur work.

(1) *Lack of knowledge.*—It is but rarely that women who undertake unpaid social work for the Church are acquainted with the State institutions which exist for similar purposes, or with the laws which bear upon them. Still more rarely have they studied any of the standard books upon the administration of charity, or even attended courses of lectures on such subjects. Consequently most of their efforts are of the nature of experiments, and many are positively harmful.

(2) *Lack of training.*—For all other serious work men and women are prepared by some kind of training, and they begin their active work under supervision. They are thus saved from elementary mistakes, which cause discouragement to themselves, and mischief to others. Churchwomen, however, are generally invited to undertake social work simply because they appear to have leisure and willingness. They commence without instruction, and go on without guidance or effectual criticism.

(3) *Lack of method.*—All serious work requires records and reports. Untrained workers have little idea how to keep records or to write reports. If they attempt anything of the kind they fail to see what is important, or even relevant. That is why the reports which are published by some large societies are at once so voluminous and so futile.

(4) *Lack of recognition.*—At present there is nothing definite to distinguish the experienced and successful worker from the latest recruit. That is bad for the recruits, who are thus encouraged to think they have nothing to learn. It is very bad for the experienced, who are discouraged by feeling that their powers are neither recognised nor fully employed. For lack of intelligent grading, women of real ability and experience, who are well fitted to be leaders, often waste their energies upon elementary tasks which a beginner could do almost as well.

(5) *Lack of oversight.*—The social workers in any given area are generally subordinate, in theory, either to the clergy or to committees of ladies. The clergy, themselves generally untrained in such matters, are not well suited for the task of guidance. The less they know of economic laws the more likely they are to mistake servility for efficiency, and to discountenance the best of their helpers. Committees of ladies might be most valuable, if only

their members were chosen for their fitness. But as a rule such committees are dominated by the unfit, who have been appointed for their supposed social importance. Having thus no business methods nor definite policy, they exercise little control, but indulge in much unwise interference.

(6) *Lack of pay.*—A good many women, able to do excellent work, and sufficiently at leisure, are really in need of a small salary. Often a payment of £20 or £30 a year would make all the difference. But the question of finance is a large one, and will be discussed in a later section.

How can these defects be remedied? Reform can only be gradual; and suggestions for the present must be limited to a few simple and practical proposals. But all proposals must be judged in the light of that new and higher conception of Church membership which is beginning to be accepted.

We must get rid of the notion that social service is a hobby which some Churchwomen take up and the majority disdain. Such service must be regarded, not as exceptional, but as normal—as at once the privilege and the duty of all Christians who have the leisure and the opportunity. And those who undertake such work must feel that their efforts will be unworthy unless they are intelligent and methodical. It is for the Kingdom of God that they are to work: and the Kingdom of God cometh not by observation, nor by impulsive efforts alternating with periods of slackness, but as the answer to sustained, prayerful, and wisely directed labour.

If such were the general feeling among Church workers, we should not find (as we do now) that a large number of the most capable and earnest women prefer to take service under the State, not so much for the sake of the pay as because the atmosphere of efficiency attracts them. In some parts of England there has been a great advance among the Church workers, some of whom reach a very high standard of knowledge and method. But there are large areas in which even the desire for such things is regarded with suspicion. And the majority of the parish clergy, even in the towns, act as a drag. They have not the knowledge necessary for directing the work, and yet they insist on keeping the direction in their own hands. Until they are either efficient or self-effacing, it will be difficult to persuade the best women to work with them.

Still there is some progress, and we may hope for more. When once the right view of the work prevails, there will be no more question of recruiting the doubtful and the unfit. The task of the Church will be rather to select the best, applying proper tests of knowledge and character, and to assign to each an appropriate sphere of activity.

In the meantime, perhaps, the most urgent practical question is how to raise the standard of knowledge about social problems. This resolves

itself into two parts, for there must be a desire for knowledge, and there must be the means of acquiring it.

(i.) All who are in a position to influence public opinion can, at least, impress upon their neighbours that social workers cannot be really efficient unless they have a fair acquaintance with the Poor Law and the institutions connected with it, the various agencies for helping in sickness, the National Insurance Act, the principles of charitable relief, and the conditions of proper housing; also with the local rates and wages and rent, the local charities and their administration. Hardly less necessary are two matters of a different class. One is the method of managing clubs and other amusements for the young. The other is the rules of procedure for a committee. The ignorance even of some educated women on this latter subject would be incredible if its disastrous effects were not so obvious.

(ii.) Most of the intending workers will not be able to learn these things from books; but will require such personal teaching and guidance as can best be given by women resident in their own neighbourhood. There must, therefore, be missionaries of social knowledge planted all over the country. But these leaders must themselves be trained, and their fitness to teach must, in some way, be guaranteed. What can be done to promote this desirable end? We cannot see very far ahead in a time when changes are so rapid, but we venture to make some suggestions.

Two or three of the new universities provide courses of study and examinations, and offer diplomas to those who pass. In one case, we believe, the Charity Organization Society gives active assistance. That is a very hopeful beginning, and it will be well if other universities follow the example of Leeds and Liverpool. But courses of study and diplomas do not solve the whole problem. If the Church wants such service it must pay for the training of those who are to render it. And the training will not be complete unless it is associated with the spirit which is generated by life in a community with kindred aims.

One condition of success, therefore, is that a larger number of scholarships should be provided to pay the expenses of suitable women during their two years of training. If each archdeaconry would promise to give one scholarship every year, a good beginning would be made.

Another condition is the establishment of hostels in connexion with the universities where such training is given. Highly desirable in the interest of comfort and economy, such places are still more important as batteries (so to speak) in which the electric current of social interest may be stored.

There is reason to hope for one institution, at least, in which all these three conditions will be satisfied. The Central Committee of Women's Church Work have now before them the plan of a residential college in

London, where teaching of a high class will be given, and degrees conferred. The plan is as yet only an outline, which cannot be completed without the expenditure of much thought and much money. But we regard its very inception as a hopeful sign.

The granting of degrees or diplomas for knowledge of social subjects will do more than guarantee the qualification of individuals. It will also popularise the notion that there are grades of efficiency which may be denoted by titles or certificates. Here may be found, perhaps, the germ of a system of recognition for social workers, who may be divided into classes according to their attainments, and promoted in due course. So the stagnant chaos which we know might gradually give place to ordered and constructive movement.

MINISTRY.

The national mission of 1916 gave prominence to a controversy which had long been latent. Women took a large part in that mission; and many of them, in the "pilgrimage of prayer," preached with conspicuous success. But they were greatly hampered by a rigid enforcement of the ecclesiastical rule which forbids women to speak in church. Surely the time has come for that remnant of an obsolete Orientalism to be removed from the Church of England. Those women who speak and preach admirably in large halls or in the open air could often give their message with better effect to congregations assembled for Sunday worship. Permission to do so is already freely given to laymen who have been accepted as "lay readers;" and their help is proving most valuable while so many of the clergy are absent on military service. It is urged with good reason that the same kind of commission should be given to women. In this case (and perhaps also in the case of men) the commission ought to have a somewhat wider scope. For in many cases the great need is not so much for formal preaching as for teaching of a more or less conversational kind. The catechising of children in church, which is an old institution, might serve as a point of departure. Why should not young men and women be invited to come to church in order to ask questions as well as to answer them about the great problems of life and eternity? The Student Christian movement seems to show that teaching through discussion is more interesting and more effective than teaching by discourse, where the audience is young and vigorous. It is also more difficult, demanding a considerable degree of knowledge and readiness.

While we are of opinion that some such commission ought to be given to women, we would urge the importance of beginning with a high standard. Some of the existing lay readers are men highly trained in philosophy and theology, and it is they who sustain the credit of the institution as a whole. The first women who speak in Churches should be comparable to these in respect of intellectual power. It is always easy to develop down-

wards, and that would be necessary in time. But, in all cases, the individuals must be carefully chosen, on account of knowledge as well as piety, eloquence, and firmness of character; they must be of sufficient age; and they must have some training. This is not meant to imply that they need all be taken from one social class. The reasons which cause lay readers to be taken from many grades of society would apply in the case of women. After a period of probation they would receive a definite commission from the bishop, as lay readers do. In our judgment, this should not be clogged with conditions which are not made in the case of men. The commission should be terminable, not necessarily for life. And it should not, however indirectly, be made to depend upon celibacy; for that would exclude many of those who could render the best service. The members of a preaching order might or might not be also doing such work as deaconesses now do. If unmarried, and able to give the greater part of their time, they might combine parochial work with preaching. But some would be married women, whose family duties prevented them from making many fixed engagements, yet whose wide outlook on life made their sermons especially valuable. We remember, for example, that Elizabeth Fry was the devoted mother of ten children at the same time when she was one of the most moving preachers in the Society of Friends.

Where, it may be asked, are women who wish to qualify themselves as preachers of the more educated kind to obtain the needful training? At present the public lectures at Oxford and Cambridge, though open to women, require a considerable knowledge of Greek and Latin, and few of the new universities provide theological teaching. Those difficulties can be overcome with a little effort. A very moderate endowment would found theological lectureships at Girton or Holloway, for instance. And the new universities are already being urged to give theological degrees of an undenominational kind. Besides, the college, which the Central Committee of Women's Church Workers propose to found, will provide for theological no less than for social instruction; and the association of the two studies under the same roof will be beneficial to both.

When once the higher theological studies are put on a sound basis, it will be comparatively easy to provide the training which is required for those whose aims are humbler; and we may hope that a complete plan would be developed within a few years.

We believe, therefore, that the demand for a preaching order of women is reasonable, and ought to be met. And we believe that a wisely organised order of women, commissioned to preach and to teach in churches, to read such services as lay readers now read, and to do the work of deaconesses, would enrich the life of the Church and extend its influence.

PRIESTHOOD.

We do not regard the ordination of women to the priesthood as a parochial question. The voices which are raised in its favour are very few, whereas the vast majority of men and women alike are strongly opposed to it. Both parties put forward *a priori* arguments based upon assumptions about the nature of man and woman, which are perhaps equally unconvincing. Both parties appeal to history; and there the conservative majority certainly has the advantage. We do not propose to discuss inconclusive arguments based upon psychology or history or authority: but are content for the present to appeal to the principle of expediency. For while the main objects of those who propose the change would be secured by the institution of a non-priestly ministry of women, such as we have indicated in the previous paragraph, there are three undeniable reasons which seem to put a feminine priesthood out of the question.

(1) Unless the functions of the priesthood, as now understood in all branches of the Catholic Church, were radically altered, it would be quite impossible for married women to perform them; and if the objections to a celibate priesthood of men have been found convincing, those which may be offered against a celibate priesthood of women are stronger still.

(2) Apart from the question of celibacy, the ordination of women would make a fresh breach between the Anglican and all other branches of the Catholic Church.

(3) In all probability it would also cause a schism in the Anglican communion itself.

CONCLUSION.

We have long known that the Church possessed, in her women members, an immense reserve of power, which ought to be developed. The war has added to our knowledge by showing how rapidly, with a moderate amount of training, women can become efficient workers in all sorts of spheres, intellectual and social. There is now no excuse for neglecting to offer women the higher opportunities of service to the Church for which many of them are eminently fitted. But, for reasons given at some length above, it would be a wrong to them as well as a hindrance to their work, if opportunities of training did not precede and prepare for the opportunities of service.

A FAMOUS WAR SERMON.

On March 12th, 1871, J. B. Mozley, then Regius Professor of Divinity of Oxford, preached a famous sermon on the text, "Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom" (Matt. xxiv. 7). It is No. 5 in his *University Sermons*, and has also been published separately. The following paper is a summary of the sermon, with quotations and comments.

He begins by insisting on the principle of nationality. The nation was prior to Christianity, and "the Church could no more ignore the State than it could the family." He rejects with scorn the theory that "The Catholic has ceased to be patriotic, and become a citizen of the Church only." There have been those who regarded poetry, art, and philosophy, as having the nature of sin. The answer to such is that "Christianity does not abolish, but purify and consecrate nature." The New Testament does not directly teach patriotism, but, as Hooker said, the Scripture does not *condemn* by omission, but only sends us back to reason and natural law. The right of war is a necessity arising out of the division of mankind into nations, owning no common centre. When disputes arise, and mutual agreement fails, force is the only alternative. Not that the right decision is always reached, for it is force and not right that decides, but "the right side makes the trial." So, we might add, does the wrong side sometimes; and the right side must risk defeat, as it ought to do, if it believes in the justice of its own cause.

Christianity "utterly denounces and condemns the motives which lead to war—ambition, rapacity, tyranny, and vanity; but *the condemnation of one side is the justification of the other;* those very motives give the right of resistance to one side." But now Mozley becomes more questionable:—

> "And inasmuch as the Church has no authority to decide which is the right side,—is no judge of national questions or of national motives, not having been made by her Divine Founder a judge or a divider in this sphere, the Church cannot, in her ignorance, exclude the other side

either. The Church therefore stands neutral, and takes in both sides; that is to say both sides fight within the bond of Christian unity."

What would Mozley have said about the "neutrality" of the Vatican to-day? It has recently been whitewashed by the Warden of Keble in a *Guardian* sermon; but most of us feel that Loisy is right. A Christian must be *impartial*, but never *neutral* in a matter of right and wrong.[1] In 1871 Mozley himself could afford to be neutral.

"Sauve mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis
E terra alterius magnum spectare laborem."

As he points out, the trouble is that nations own no power above them. The individual gets his disputes settled for him in a law-court. But then he is compelled to accept the judge's decision, for a court of justice possesses, in reserve, exactly the same kind of force as an army, only it does not as a rule need to exert it. In the case of civil war, the headship of the nation has temporarily given way; in international war, no such headship ever existed. And if it did exist, it would always be possible for a strong nation to rebel against it. Hence a universal empire would be as futile as it is in fact impracticable. Mozley therefore does not encourage us to hope for much from a League of Nations. And indeed it can never take us all the way. The gradual diffusion of the Spirit of Christ is the only thing that can render it adequate,—or unnecessary; and Mozley is curiously deficient here.

He goes on to talk of necessary wars of "re-adjustment" and "re-construction," and "progress," "the opening out of political nature, seeking relief and proper scope in new divisions." In other words, when a nation expands sufficiently, she must claim her place in the sun by fair means or foul. Mozley cannot have seen the logical results of his doctrine. It is just what Germany believes. Wars of progress "may be really necessary for the due advantage of mankind and growth of society." When he speaks of the moral side of war, as a mode of obtaining justice, he is on surer ground:—

[1] *La Guerre et la Religion.*

"It is the sacred and serious object, which *so far* attaches to war, which gives war its morality; and enables it to produce its solemnising type of character."

We must not confuse the moral effects of war with the physical. The horrors of war are "dreadful as misery, not as sin."

"More sin is committed every day in every capital of Europe than on the largest field of battle."

Those who know how Germany has "murdered war" as well as peace, might disagree here, but it was worth saying. The New Testament, Mozley observes, never disparages the military life. It is taken for granted, and military metaphors and allusions are frequent. It would be strange, as Mr. Emmet points out in *The Faith and the War*, if a preacher who entirely disapproved of betting, were to draw many of his illustrations from the betting-ring, without one word of condemnation for it.

Still higher is the sacrificial and mediatorial function of war. The individual is nothing, his country everything. To the aggressor war is killing, but to the defender it is dying for others. "Greater love hath no man." Here we reach the heart of the Gospel. And there is no *necessary* connection between fighting and hating. As we remember, the German hymn of hate only provoked astonishment and ridicule among ourselves. But does this ring true now?

"Take two hostile armies, and the total amount of anger is in almost spectral and unearthly contrast with the hideous mass of injury. It is like a tempest without a wind. The enmity is in the two wholes—the abstractions; the individuals are at peace."

And this?

"In Christian war, upon each one is the Holy Spirit's seal of peace, and on the mass wild nature's stamp of discord."

But if war, as waged by Germany and against Germany, is so obviously and flagrantly un-Christian, this very fact helps us to hate it as Christians ought to hate it.

Mozley then returns to the universal empire theory, and gives a masterly analysis of it. An individual accepts the verdict of a neutral (in the person of a judge)) because he is compelled to do so. But a nation is not so compelled, and

"a nation knows it does justice to its own case; it cannot be sure that another will do so." An individual can surrender his own moral judgment to another "if he is not certain; but if he feels certain it is almost a contradiction to do so." The only deducible solution seems to be that there must be force enough in reserve to compel a recalcitrant nation to accept the verdict of the rest of the world. Thus we cannot get away from force. When a nation's own safety is concerned, it naturally trusts its own sense of justice before that of another, and "a nation's abandonment of its own rights means the individual sacrificing the nation; for the nation only acts through individuals. The individual is humble not for himself, but for another, which is a very different thing." The Gospel, as Canon Streeter[2] says, tells a man to turn his cheek to the smiter, but it never tells him to turn his sister's cheek.

Mozley is no shallow optimist. "What sign is there," he asks, "that the progress of society can ever alter the existing plan of the world, or rather want of plan, from which war comes—viz., a want of all head to the nations and states of the world, that progress can give natural society a vertex which nature has not given?" War he regards as part of the unalterable nature of things. Can Christianity be expected to end it?

> "It is no part of the mission of Christianity to reconstruct the order of the world. . . . Progress has not done it, within whose sphere it rather is. Without indeed any correction of the structure of the world, a universal change in the temper of mankind would stop war. But Christianity is not remedial to the whole of human nature, but only to those that receive it."

Here, once more, he provokes criticism. Huxley's saying about moral progress being at war with the cosmic process comes to mind. Would any respectable theologian now go so far as Mozley,—or rather, claim as little as he does for the regenerating power of Christianity? But his strong common-sense saves him from the popular error of confusing ideals with facts—what ought to be with what actually is. His case is therefore stronger than one would wish it to be. Christianity

[2] *The War, this War, and the Sermon on the Mount.*

has not abolished force in civil government, and as he insists again, "war and civil government are branches of one common stock." Nor has he any encouragement for those who "go on thinking of this world as advancing to some indefinite state of perfection." He appears to favour implicitly the old view of history as a series of recurrent cycles. The great prophecy of peace in Isaiah ii. 4, he pronounces, surely with doubtful exegesis, to be just as applicable to civil government as to war. Those words are all vision, he says, whereas Christ's words, which form the text of this sermon, are all matter of fact.

> "With respect to this world, later or Gospel prophecy is, if one may say so, singularly unenthusiastic; it draws no sanguine picture, is in no ecstasy about humanity, speaks of no regeneration of society here; it uses the language of melancholy fact."

The New Testament certainly gives us a great deal of ground for despairing of a kingdom of God in this world, and placing it entirely in the next. But it scarcely allows us to put war and property on the same level as necessary evils, for this is really what Mozley proceeds to do:—

> "Community of goods is better than the appropriation of them, and the renunciation of the sword better than the use of it, provided only these agree with the necessities of society." . . . "The right of property was open to the greatest abuses; the right of war was a great evil to prevent a greater; but they were *necessary*—absolutely necessary, therefore Christianity did not shrink from them."

Certain poisons are used in small doses as tonics.

"Christianity," says Mozley, "is burdened by having to act upon an alien hypothesis." He speaks of it as "weighted with human nature," as though human nature were wholly evil. Here, perhaps, the dark shadow of S. Augustine has rested upon him, as it still rests upon some of us.

The last page of the sermon is unfortunately the weakest. It is concerned with the commonplace truth that Christianity consoles the sufferings of war. The military commander is not concerned with the sufferers by war and their consolation.

> "No! force is all he has to do with; if he thinks of the persons he totters; if he pities, he is gone."

What about Wellington's tears after Waterloo? Or even Napoleon's magnetic power of inspiring men to follow him?

Generals are not all monarchs who have tamed and enlisted Jehovah, and can afford to lose a million men. Nor is the final sentence of these twenty-eight octavo pages quite just:—

> "Mankind is all mass to the human eye, and all individual to the Divine."

But the sermon as a whole is a remarkably sane and cogent piece of reasoning, and well worthy of careful study, especially by those who are tempted to doubt the justice of our agony for righteousness and freedom to-day.

T. F. Royds.

AN EPISCOPAL APPEAL TO CONSCIENCE.[1]

Our Anglican Polycrates, the Bishop of Gloucester, has just brought out a little book on Clerical Subscription, addressed particularly to the clergy of his diocese. The Bishop gives his book the sub-title, "An Appeal to Conscience." It contains a good deal of interesting information about subscription, and might, with some modifications, be usefully inserted as an appendix to the Bishop's book on the XXXIX Articles where, if we recollect rightly, the subject of subscription is not treated with the fulness which it deserves.

Inasmuch as this book claims to be an appeal to conscience, we naturally expect that it should be scrupulously careful to state the case for the tender conscience as fully and as strongly as possible. This the Bishop seems to us to fail to do. He writes of the form of subscription legalised in 1865 (which is in force to-day):—

> "That there is ground for holding that relief was given to tender consciences by the change made in 1865 is not denied; but it is very easy to exaggerate the nature of the 'relief' given by the new form." (p. 22).

But is it not the case that at least one object, if not the main object of the promoters of the measure, was to give relief to tender clerical consciences, which F. D. Maurice's *Theological Essays*, Darwin's *Origin of Species*, Huxley's debate with Samuel Wilberforce, *Essays and Reviews*, and the teaching of Bishops Hampden, Thirlwall, Colenso, and the Tractarian controversy had rendered particularly tender. Dr. Gibson writes:—

> "We are told that it is only a 'general' assent that we are called on to declare, though the word 'general' occurs nowhere in it, and the terms certainly seem rather precise."

[1] *The Declaration of Assent.* An Appeal to Conscience, by Edgar Charles Sumner, Bishop of Gloucester. S.P.C.K., 2/- net.

If they seem rather precise to the Bishop it must be because he has failed to notice that Sir George Grey (the Home Secretary) declared when the Bill was before the House of Commons that the object of the measure was to secure a public declaration by the clergy of "their general agreement with the doctrines of the Church, and their readiness to conform to her ritual." Moreover although the present terms of subscription may seem "rather precise" to the Bishop, is it not the case that they are general and vague in comparison with the terms used in those forms of subscription which they replaced? Dean Stanley states that:—

> "In that Act of Parliament, framed in contradiction to Convocation, and carried irrespectively of its late adhesion, every particularity of phrase by which our forefathers had so laboriously attempted to bind the consciences of posterity is totally abandoned."[2]

Such phrases as "willingly," "*ex animo*," "unfeigned consent," no longer appeared in the new form. Subscription was no longer made to "all and every the XXXIX. Articles," to "*all and everything* contained in the Book of Common Prayer." Instead, "assent," not "assent and consent," is given to the "doctrine," not "doctrines" of the United Church of England and Ireland, and a belief is expressed that it is agreeable to the Word of God.

Moreover, the Bishop unduly belittles the speech of Mr. Buxton, whom he calls "the Liberal member for Folkestone, whose theology was as liberal as his politics." Has the Bishop failed to realise that Mr. Buxton was one of the Royal Commissioners, and that his speech was no irresponsible utterance, but an explanation to the House of Commons of the scope of the Bill, especially in its bearing on the enlargement of the forms of clerical subscription, and that (as Dean Stanley asserts) Mr. Buxton's speech was "uncontradicted either by any of the Royal Commissioners present, or by any member of the Government?" (*op. cit.*, p. 161). What is undeniable is that Mr. Buxton's conclusions are based on facts, and facts which can be verified at any time by comparing carefully the new form of subscription with the old. Sir R. Palmer's speech, quoted by the Bishop, does not contradict Mr. Buxton's statements, but seeks to remove any possible misunderstanding of them. The Bill was not, he said, "a sort of banner of revolution," but it had as one of its objects "to relieve scrupulous consciences."

Indeed, we believe, that the Act in question may not improperly be regarded as the *Magna Carta* of Anglican Liberalism.

On p. 40, the Bishop refers to the resolution passed in April, 1914, by the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, and cites that part of it which supports his own view of subscription, but he does not cite the part which states the opposite side, neither does he refer to the Primate's interpretation of it. Again, on p. 42, as they support his case, the Bishop refers with approbation to Professor H. Sidgwick's essays on clerical veracity, and writes, "I may add that nothing I have seen seems to me to afford any fair reply to the position there taken up," but he does not refer his readers to Dr. Rashdall's reply to Professor Sidgwick in the *International Journal of Ethics*, although on p. 37 the Bishop quotes Dr. Rashdall as that

[2] *Essays in Church and State*, new ed., 1884, p. 175.

"distinguished scholar," where he finds that he can be cited to support the Bishop's contention that "*a line must be drawn somewhere.*"

It must not be supposed for a moment that we accuse the Bishop of *mala fides*, but we do charge him with lacking that judicial spirit and absolute impartiality, which we should look for in an English Judge summing up for an English jury. The Bishop's book, although it has as its sub-title, *An Appeal to Conscience*, and so ought to be of a character which no responsible religious person can make except as standing in the presence of God, seems to us to shew much less moral sensitiveness than we have a right to expect from one in his position. Had the Bishop not described his *ex parte* statement as *An Appeal to Conscience*, we should not have felt it needful to indicate that it lacks that scrupulous impartiality which is indispensable to such an appeal. Should the Bishop publish a second edition, we hope that he will give references to Dean Stanley's *Essays on Church and State* (new ed., 1884), especially to essays iv. and v., which deal particularly with the changes of 1865, and also references to Dean Rashdall's reply to Professor Sidgwick, which may be found in the *International Journal of Ethics*, vol. iii. (Jan., 1897).

H.D.A.M.

THE CHURCH IN THE FURNACE.[1]

A chaplain, obliged to return to his parish from the Front, is struck by the fact that the Church at home seems to have been "marking time." While he himself cannot carry on as he did before, he finds that some amongst his own people have had little premonition of the fact that, as the men are different, so must the padres, who have shared their experiences and their life, be affected in their attitude towards their future work. The writer started off in his very first sermon to tell his people that they must begin at once to prepare for the return of the men; he introduced changes and explained them at a meeting held in the church.

But, of course, scattered individuals can do little to influence the general outlook; and so, when he came across this book and found much that he had said and thought corroborated by men of much wider B.E.F. experience, he was overjoyed.

Written by many men of distinction, and prefaced by the Chaplains' Bishop, it must do much to pave the way to reform. Many aspects of the question are discussed, but the general message is the same—changes of all sorts *must* be faced, and experience gained is ripe for immediate fruiting.

The soldier's religion is discussed, and his difficulties are faced. The padre puts himself in the witness-box about his own training. Owing to the fact that most of these men are busy and away from the leisure that essays require there is a slight tendency to diffuseness. And the book and its testimony is so important that it would be a real gain if the editor—or the authors themselves—could cut out what, on second thoughts, may seem to them not indispensable to their cause.

[1] *The Church in the Furnace.* Edited by Canon Macnutt. (Macmillan & Co., 5/-).

A book like this should be in the hands, not only of the clergy, but of churchwardens and members of parochial councils. But it cannot get to these unless it is considerably reduced in size and produced at less than half the price.

We are told on good authority that some of our home Bishops are willing that we should make experiments, and, indeed, want us to do so. Many of us would welcome, not only a tacit sanction, but a lead! Some of us returned chaplains are meeting to confer on what can be done to get under way without further procrastination. We know that the men will not return (as some seem to imagine) *per saltum*, and that they will be settling down in their old parishes by dozens and scores, over a considerable period of time. Before this begins we should be ready; and, in a sense, it has already begun in the the case of the discharged, and of the cadet schools, and of others in training as machine-gunners or as "specialists."

With regard to the religion of the soldier, Canon Hannay's description is most in harmony with what I have observed. Mr. Barry refers to "services and Prayer Book reformation" as "after all a superficial matter;" but Canon Woodward is surely right when he insists that the question is a very live one, because men get their idea of the Church and (much more important, of course) of God from the accredited ways of approach to Him.

There is naturally a great deal of perturbation at the fewness of our communicants. Various remedies are suggested, and evening communions are boldly advocated, though one writer would endeavour to let himself down lightly by suggesting an evening participation in the reserved sacrament. This is too obviously a compromise to save the face of the fasting rule. To deprive the men of the prayer of consecration, unless time forbids, would seem a needless mutilation of the service, tending to depreciate in some way what cannot be depreciated—the importance of "discerning the Lord's body."

The book goes to show that the British soldier is a man who exhibits many of the fruits of the Spirit. The Church of England has had a real share in this result, which has been tried in the burning fiery furnace. At the same time it is maintained that he is in civil life at least out of touch with the "Rock whence he was hewn," or "blown." He is now in some sort of touch: how can we maintain it when war conditions are gone by?

We must beware of one thing. His finest asset is a conscience—not morbid, but distinctly exacting. He will not countenance shams in himself or in his comrades. This is why many come seldom to Holy Communion. He does not trust himself. We tell him he can trust his God. But he cannot promise that he will follow His guidance. He can realise forgiveness, but feels that he will fall again, and he is not quite sure that he will be altogether sorry if he does. And so he prefers to be quite straight about it and stays away.

Can we blame him? And is it wise to attempt to "let down" his conscience or to salve it by suggesting non-communicating attendance as a compromise? He will probably reply that it is all one to him, and that if he goes at all he may as well get *all* the service gives.

There is one reference in the book to convalescents which, after a year with them, I should like strongly to endorse. One might have expected

them to be restless after hospital confinement, but I found the men most responsive. I had no difficulty in arranging and conducting one "Retreat" for them: had I stayed I could have arranged Retreats once a fortnight quite easily. I am sure that if these men are met half-way by the Church and our congregations with sympathetic insight into their needs as worshippers quite a considerable proportion can be retained, first as earnest inquirers, and then as active adherents of the old Church reformed and reinvigorated.

W. D. Bainbridge-Bell,
Vicar of Epsom; ex-C.F.

AN APOLOGY FOR THE NATIONAL CHURCH.[1]

The Principal of the Leeds Clergy School has written a promising book on the position and ideals of the Church of England, promising, not simply because we may anticipate further volumes from his pen, but because this volume exhibits its writer's capacity to be influenced by the Liberal Movement in theology, and that to a much greater degree than he is himself aware. It is true that he deals exceedingly briefly and somewhat contemptuously with "the small but active party which describes itself as Modernist," and remarks that it "seems to have a very large number of adherents in the Student Christian Movement," but he appears to know little about its ideals. He describes Modernists as:—

> "Those who . . . postulate an internecine war between Authority and Experience, and proceed to build a somewhat fantastic structure upon this extremely sandy foundation." (p. 36).

Mr. Malden would do well to read the more characteristically Modernist writers, or, at least, reflect on the following definition of a Modernist by the late George Tyrrell, who, at least, may claim to have known what he was writing about:—

> "By a Modernist, I mean a Churchman of any sort, who believes in the possibility of a synthesis between the essential truth of his religion and the essential truth of modernity."

Professor Percy Gardner, writing, as a Modernist, in the opening chapter of a recent volume, thus defines his task:—

> "I think it possible to combine in a higher unity the two ways of looking at Christian history, the evolutional and the inspirational."

To assert, therefore, as Mr. Malden does, that the Modernist says: "The past has no lessons of any kind which I need learn" (p. 37), is a grotesque libel on men whose critical study of the past, especially in the departments of Church history and dogma, is mainly responsible for their being Modernists.

The Principal of Leeds Clergy School will doubtless be surprised to learn that his book indicates that he is himself a half-fledged Modernist, so little is it possible for the earnest to escape the influence of their environment.

[1] *Watchman, what of the Night?* by R. H. Malden, M.A., F.R. Hist. Soc.; Chaplain R.N., 5/- net. Macmillans (1918).

We find that he believes strongly in two views, which are essentially Modernist:—(1) That current ecclesiastical views and practices should be tested by asking: How do they agree with the mind of Christ? (2) That not the standards of the past, but the present guidance and grace of the Holy Spirit is the supreme need for the Church and the individual.

When Mr. Malden is considering such questions as High Mass *versus* Holy Communion, and Benediction with Exposition of the Reserved Sacrament *versus* Evening Prayer, he rightly urges that we must take as our test, not ancient practice or modern taste, but the mind of Christ. In other words: "Is this or anything like it, what our Lord meant?" (p. 18). He even avers that the present-day doctrinal weakness of the Church of England is due to "our neglect of the Holy Spirit." It is quite in harmony with such convictions that Mr. Malden should have no sympathy with the view that the past must be the master of the present:—

> "There seem to be many people who are convinced that the Church must be for ever precluded from saying or doing whatever it has never said or done before. If this view should prevail our days are assuredly numbered and we shall leave no appreciable gap when we finally disappear." (p. 36).

Why, then, if Mr. Malden has this way of looking at things, is he not a full-fledged Modernist? It is because he is apparently quite uninfluenced by the higher criticism of the New Testament. We rather suspect that he has had little or no formal or rigorous training in modern Biblical studies. He writes like a scholarly, sober-minded clergyman, well-read in the history of the English Church, and thoroughly loyal to it, but at the same time he frequently betrays the fact that his formal studies have not lain in those departments which produce the scientific rather than the dogmatic attitude towards theological and ecclesiastical questions.

His book, however, deserves attention, and we commend it especially to those who are not sure whether they ought not to be Roman Catholics rather than English Churchmen. Its attitude here is well summed up in the saying quoted from Tyrrell:—

> "If the Protestant countries are dying, the Catholic ones are already dead."

It would also enlighten many laymen who are rightly dissatisfied with the defects of the English Church, but are also unhappily blind to her many virtues, and to the steady progress she is making in various directions.

The volume contains a number of valuable, although not altogether original aphorisms, *e.g.*:—

> "Sacraments—be it said with all reverence—are very dangerous things" (p. 26).
>
> "The Church as an institution does not deserve any very high degree of loyalty from its members until it is seen to be His (the Holy Spirit's) organ and the vehicle of His Presence" (p. 122).
>
> "The only real test of the efficiency of a religious teacher is to be found by watching the development of character in those who are taught by him" (p. 166).

"We must challenge the apparently wide-spread belief that a false doctrine becomes true in a semi-automatic fashion when it has been held by a certain number of people for two centuries, or that it can be made true by the personal piety of its adherents" (p. 235).

In discussing the theory of the Church, Mr. Malden, who knows his subject well, has much to say that is of interest. One point he emphasises especially:—

"The Bishop is the representative of the Laity."

Hence he affirms that:—

"The nearest approach to primitive practice, expressing the true theory of the episcopate, to be found at the present day, is in England. In England Bishops are nominated by the Sovereign on the advice of the Prime Minister of the day: that is, by the two laymen who may most fairly be considered to represent the entire laity of the nation. Our custom is the legitimate development of the primitive practice amongst a people who make much of representative institutions" (p. 156).

This was also the view of the democratic historian, J. R. Green:—

"The nomination of bishops ever since the accession of the Georges passed from the king in person to the minister who represented the will of the people. Practically, therefore, an English prelate, alone among the prelates of the world, is now raised to his episcopal throne by the same popular election which raised Ambrose to his episcopal chair at Milan."[2]

This has a bearing on a story recently told by Mr. Temple:—

"An American Churchman replied to the question: What do you think of the English method of appointing bishops? It is profane. What do you think of the bishops? They are the best in Christendom."

A deeper knowledge of history spoils the epigram.

In regard to the election of bishops, Mr. Malden is convinced that:—

"The laity must somehow have the right of choice. The clergy must have the right to reject the man chosen, lest the laity should abuse their power or exercise it carelessly."

This clerical right of rejecting, Mr. Malden holds, is preserved by the issue of the *congé d'élire* to the Cathedral Chapter, who, in this matter, are representative of the Diocesan clergy.

Our author sympathises with the ideal of a National Church, the supreme duty of which is to develop the conscience of Englishmen, or as Mr. Malden expresses it in a fine sentence:—

"The end of every ministry is to produce the largest possible number of people equipped with imperiously sensitive consciences; that is of people furnished with a quick and unerring power of detecting wrong, whether public or private, however subtly it may be disguised, and with an unflinching determination to make whatever sacrifice may be demanded by the cause of what they know to be right" (p. 40).

H.D.A.M.

[2] J. R. Green. *A Short History of the English People*, vol. 8, p. 319.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A PRACTICAL PROPOSAL.

SIR, *To the Editor of the* MODERN CHURCHMAN.

To many it is given to have a desire for the growth of comprehensiveness and unity in the affairs of the Kingdom of Christ, but to few on the other hand that accurate knowledge of theology sufficient to deal with the details about which the various members of the Kingdom differ.

I write only from the standpoint of one who desires comprehensiveness and unity, and though interested in theology, do not claim accuracy of knowledge. I want then to submit that the advance of great causes is often delayed for long periods of years by the attempt to remedy all the evil at once, to make a complete and logical scheme, whereas a smaller scheme could be carried through speedily by agreement in a way more congenial to the English temperament.

By the smaller method I think we could make a valuable advance even now. Consider the list in the Life and Liberty papers of the evils in Church organization; and in the *Modern Churchman* the suggestions for reforms of various kinds.

I think it must be possible to select out of these lists of proposed reforms at least two or three of each which would be accepted, and perhaps earnestly desired, by broad-minded men of all parties. My suggestion is that a conference should be got together to select the objects upon which unity could be reasonably expected; that an attempt should be made to carry through those reforms within, say, six months' time, and, those having been accomplished, another attempt should be made with a further set of objects.

So, it appears to me, we should be continuously narrowing down the number of points of difference, and we should be permitting the Church organization to grow healthily at least in a few directions.

F. H. ANSON.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY'S ACTION.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I must ask leave to protest against the quotation from the *Salisbury Times* in your March number, which is adduced as a proof of lay dissatisfaction with episcopal action. To avoid misapprehension I would say that I have no theological axe to grind in doing this: my own inclination is for the empty cross rather than for the crucifix as a symbol. You suggest that the attack on the Bishop of Salisbury, from which you quote, is, at any rate to some extent, representative of public opinion in Salisbury. No one who knows the facts would accept this view, which implies that the Bishop has been forcing wayside crucifixes on unwilling Churchmen in order to please wealthy donors. Those who are acquainted with the private circumstances and

sorrows of the donors can only regard such an insinuation as cruel. But what I am concerned to say is that as regards the Bishop the attack has been strongly reprobated not only by Churchmen, but also, as I can testify from personal knowledge, by leading Nonconformists. It proceeds from a quarter in which an attitude to religion is adopted, which, however much we may respect its sincerity, gives no claim to speak for either Nonconformists or Churchmen. It is especially deplorable at the present moment because for some time the Bishop of Salisbury has been quietly and successfully working for a co-operation between the Church and Nonconformists which shall go far deeper than the mere exchange of compliments. Under his leadership important steps have already been taken, and we are encouraged to hope for great developments. It must be frankly said that local opinion regards the attack which you have quoted as intended to give at least no help to these developments. I am sure you would not willingly aid in hindering them.

C. T. DIMONT.

Church House, Salisbury,
April 6, 1918.

[A leading article in the newspaper of his cathedral city, attacking the Bishop's action must be regarded as *prima facie* evidence of lay dissatisfaction with the episcopal action. While therefore accepting Principal Dimont's personal assurance that the editor of the *Salisbury Times* misjudged public opinion in Salisbury, we regard as justified our own reference to the article as a "sign of the times."

We hope that the Bishop's endeavours to secure co-operation between Churchmen and Nonconformists will shortly have developed sufficiently to enable us to call the attention of our readers to them.—ED. *M.C.*].

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I read, with interest, in the *Modern Churchman* a criticism on the leading article in the *Salisbury Times*, in which the following words occur:—"The leader-writer believes that the majority of Englishmen object to the erection of Calvaries in public places, and urges that instead of raising our hats . . . when we pass a Calvary, we should do it whenever we pass a wounded or disabled soldier, for he is the living personification of the spirit of the life that preceded Calvary." Immediately after reading this, I came across the same thought in other words: My husband—home on leave from France—was speaking to a miner in Scotland. Just then a terribly wounded soldier passed them. The miner looked at him and said:—"I never see one of those poor fellows without thinking of the words: 'This, My body, is broken for you.'"

16, *Norham Gardens, Oxford,*
8th April, 1918.

HELEN GIBBON.

**** The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters.